arXiv:1211.0045v1 [math.AP] 31 Oct 2012

Derivation of a homogenized von-Kármán shell theory from 3D elasticity

Peter Hornung Igor Velčić

November 2, 2012

Abstract

We derive the model of homogenized von Kármán shell theory, starting from three dimensional nonlinear elasticity. The original three dimensional model contains two small parameters: the oscillations of the material ε and the thickness of the shell h. Depending on the asymptotic ratio of these two parameters, we obtain different asymptotic theories. In the case $h \ll \varepsilon$ we identify two different asymptotic theories, depending on the ratio of h and ε^2. In the case of convex shells we obtain a complete picture in the whole regime $h \ll \varepsilon$.

Keywords: elasticity, dimension reduction, homogenization, shell theory, two-scale convergence.

1 Introduction

This paper is about von-Kármán theory for thin elastic shells. There is a vast literature on shell theory in elasticity. An overview about the derivation of models for linear and nonlinear shells by the method of formal asymptotic expansions can be found in [Cia00]. In the case of linearly elastic shells, the models thus obtained can also be justified by a rigorous convergence result, starting from three dimensional linearized elasticity (see also [CL96, CLM96]).
In the last two decades, rigorous justifications of nonlinear models for rods, curved rods, plates and shells were obtained by means of Γ-convergence, starting from three dimensional nonlinear elasticity. The first papers in that direction are [ABP91, LDR95, LDR96] for the string model, membrane plate and shell model respectively. The rigorous derivation of nonlinear bending theory of plate was achieved in [FJM02]; see also [Pan01] for an earlier result in this direction. Föppl-von Kármán theory for plates was derived in [FJM06]. In [MM03, MM04], bending and von Kármán theories for rods were derived. In [FJMM03] the nonlinear bending theory shell model was derived, and in [LMP10] the von Kármán shell model was derived.

Here we are interested in an the ansatz-free derivation of a homogenized von Kármán shell theory by simultaneous homogenization and dimension reduction. Our starting point is the energy functional from $3d$ nonlinear elasticity. It attributes to a deformation u of a given shell $S^h \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ of small thickness $h > 0$ around a surface $S \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ the stored elastic energy

$$\frac{1}{h^4\,|S^h|}\int_{S^h} W_\varepsilon(x, \nabla u(x))\,dx, \qquad u \in H^1(S^h, \mathbb{R}^3). \tag{1}$$

Here W_ε is a non-degenerate stored energy function that oscillates periodically on the surface, with some period $\varepsilon \ll 1$. We are interested in the effective behavior when both the thickness h and the period ε are small. The separate limits $h \to 0$ and $\varepsilon \to 0$ are reasonably well understood: In [LMP10] it is shown that, when W_ε does not depend on ε, then the functionals (1) Γ-converge as $h \to 0$ to a two-dimensional von Kármán shell theory. Regarding the limit $\varepsilon \to 0$, which is related to homogenization, the first rigorous results relevant in nonlinear elasticity were obtained by Braides [Bra85] and independently by Müller [Mül87]. They proved that, under suitable growth assumptions on W_ε, the energy (1) Γ-converges as $\varepsilon \to 0$ (and h fixed) to the functional obtained by replacing W_ε in (1) with the homogenized energy density given by an infinite-cell homogenization formula.

In this paper we study the asymptotic behavior when both the thickness h and the period ε tend to zero *simultaneously*. As a Γ-limit we obtain a two-dimensional von Kármán shell model with homogenized material properties. Recently, the von Kárman plate model (see [NV]), the bending plate models (see [HNV]), and bending rod models (see [Neu10, Neu12]), were analyzed in this way. Simultaneous homogenization and dimensional reduction was also done in the case of periodically wrinkled plate (see [Vel]). As explained there, in these cases one does not obtain infinite-cell homogenization formula like in the membrane case (see [BFF00, BB06]). The basic reason for that is the fact since we are in small strain regimes, the energy is essentially convex in the strain. This is the main reason why we can use two scale convergence techniques in all these cases. However, every case has its own peculiarities. In the von Kármán theory of plates, one obtains a limiting quadratic energy density which is continuous in the asymptotic ratio γ between h and ε, for all $\gamma \in [0, \infty]$. Moreover, the case $\gamma = 0$ corresponds to the situation when the dimensional reduction dominates and the obtained model is just the homogenized von Kármán plate model. The situation $\gamma = \infty$ corresponds to the case when homogenization dominates and the obtained model is the von Kármán plate model of the homogenized functional.

In case of von Kármán shell theory studied in the present paper, we encounter two different scenarios in the regime $h \ll \varepsilon$, depending whether $h \sim \varepsilon^2$ or $h \ll \varepsilon^2$. Our main result is presented in Theorem 4.5. We are not able to cover the case $h \ll \varepsilon^2$ in a generic way for arbitrary reference surfaces S. A stronger influence of the geometry of the reference surface S is expected in this case. In fact, in the case when S is a convex surface, we succesfully derive the limiting model even for the regime $h \ll \varepsilon^2$, see Theorem 5.3.

Our analysis requires both: techniques from dimension reduction, in particular, the quantitative rigidity estimate and approximation schemes developed in [FJM02, FJM06]; and techniques from homogenization methods, in particular, two-scale convergence [Ngu89, All92, Vis06, Vis07]. To our knowledge our result is the first rigorous result combining homogenization and dimension reduction for shells in the von Kármán regime. The homogenization for linearly elastic shells was carried out in [Lut85].

Notation

- $\mathbb{R}^+ := [0, +\infty)$ is the set of non-negative real numbers;
- $\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2, \mathbf{e}_3$ denotes the standard basis in $\mathbb{R}^3$;
- we decompose $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$ as $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) = (\hat{x}, x_3)$ with $\hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $x_3 \in \mathbb{R}$;
- $a \cdot b$ denotes the scalar product of the vectors a, b;
- $\mathbb{M}^d$ denotes the space of $d \times d$ real matrices;
- $\mathbb{M}^d_{\text{sym}}$ denotes the set of $d \times d$ symmetric matrices
- $\mathbb{M}(V)$ denotes the set of bilinear forms over the vector space V.
- $\mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}(V)$ denotes the set of symmetric and bilinear forms on V. By $L^2(S; \mathbb{M}_{\text{sym}}(TS))$ we denote the quadratic forms on the surface S, whose coordinates belong to L^2. We use similar notations for other regularity assumptions.
- $\operatorname{sym} A = 1/2(A + A^{\text{t}})$ symmetric part;
- $\text{SO}(d) := \{\, R \in \mathbb{M}^d \ :\ R^{\text{t}}R = I,\ \det R = 1 \,\}$ is the set of rotations of $\mathbb{R}^d$; $\mathbb{M}^3$.
- we denote the components of a vector (or vector field) $\mathbf{c}$ by $\mathbf{c}_\alpha := \mathbf{c} \cdot \mathbf{e}_\alpha$; in particular we denote by $\hat{\mathbf{c}}$ the vector $(\mathbf{c}_1, \mathbf{c}_2)^{\text{t}}$.
- $\partial_\alpha y$ denotes the partial derivative of y in direction $\mathbf{e}_\alpha$. We set $\hat{\nabla} y := (\partial_1 y, \partial_2 y)$ and define the scaled deformation gradient as $\nabla_h y := (\hat{\nabla} y, \frac{1}{h}\partial_3 y)$.

- ε and h denote generic elements of vanishing sequences of positive numbers $\{\varepsilon\}$ and $\{h\}$, respectively;
- $A \lesssim B$ means that the inequality holds up to a multiplicative constant that only depends on the reference domain S^1 and the constants of ellipticity α, β as well as the constants η_1, η_2 defined in (2) . We write $A \ll B$ if the constant is much smaller than 1.
- for simplicity we will write dx instead of $d\mathcal{H}^2(x)$ to denote integration with respect to the two-dimensional Hausdorff measure on the surface.

$L^p(D;\mathbb{R}^d)$, $H^1(D;\mathbb{R}^d)$, $W^{1,p}(D;\mathbb{R}^d)$, $H^1_0(D;\mathbb{R}^d)$, and $W^{1,p}_0(D;\mathbb{R}^d)$ denote the standard Lebesgue, Hilbert and Sobolev spaces of maps from D to $\mathbb{R}^d$, and the associated subspaces of functions vanishing on the boundary ∂D (in the sense of traces); if no confusion occurs, we tacitly write $L^p(D), H^1(D), \ldots$ or even simply $L^p, H^1, \ldots$. In this paper we frequently encounter function spaces of periodic functions. We denote by $\mathcal{Y}$ the real line $\mathbb{R}$ equipped with the torus topology, that is $y{+}1$ and y are identified in $\mathcal{Y}$. We write $C(\mathcal{Y})$ to denote the space of continuous functions $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $f(y+1) = f(y)$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}$. Clearly, $C(\mathcal{Y})$ endowed with the norm $||f||_\infty := \sup_{y\in Y} |f(y)|$ is a Banach space. Moreover, we set $C^k(\mathcal{Y}) := C^k(\mathbb{R}) \cap C(\mathcal{Y})$ and denote by $L^2(\mathcal{Y})$, $H^1(\mathcal{Y})$ and $H^1(S{\times}\mathcal{Y})$ the closure of $C^\infty(\mathcal{Y})$ and $C^\infty(\bar{S};C^\infty(\mathcal{Y}))$ w. r. t. the norm in $L^2(Y)$, $H^1(Y)$ and $H^1(S{\times}Y)$, respectively. By $\dot{L}^2(\mathcal{Y})$, $\dot{H}^k(\mathcal{Y})$ we denote the subspace of functions $H^k(\mathcal{Y})$ whose mid-value over $\mathcal{Y}$ is zero. Obviously, all these spaces are Banach spaces. For $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ measurable and X a Banach space, $L^2(A;X)$ is understood in the sense of Bochner. We tacitly identify the spaces $L^2(A;L^2(B))$ and $L^2(A\times B)$; since whenever $f \in L^2(A\times B)$, then there exists a function $\tilde f \in L^2(A;L^2(B))$ with $f = \tilde f$ almost everywhere in $A \times B$.

2 General framework

We assume that $\omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a bounded domain of class C^3, we set $I := (-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ and $\Omega^h := \omega \times (hI)$, and $\Omega := \omega \times I$. We assume that the limit

$$\gamma := \lim_{h\to 0} \tfrac{h}{\varepsilon(h)}$$

exists in $[0,\infty]$. We will frequently write ε instead of $\varepsilon(h)$, but always with the understanding that ε depends on h via γ.

Let S be a compact connected oriented surface with boundary which is embedded in $\mathbb{R}^3$. For convenience only, we assume that S is parametrized by a single chart: From now on, $\psi \in C^3(\overline{\omega};\mathbb{R}^3)$ denotes an embedding with $\psi(\omega) = S$. The inverse of ψ is denoted by $r : S \to \omega$, and we assume it to be of class C^3. We leave it to the interested reader to verify to which extent these regularity assumptions on S can be weakened without altering our arguments.

By $n : S \to \mathbb{S}^2$ we denote the unit normal; more precisely we set

$$n(\psi(x)) = \frac{\partial_1\psi(x) \wedge \partial_2\psi(x)}{|\partial_1\psi(x) \wedge \partial_2\psi(x)|} \text{ for all } x \in \omega.$$

By $T_{\hat x}S$ we denote the tangent space to S at $\hat x$, and

$$\Pi(\hat x) = \nabla n(\hat x)$$

is the Weingarten map on S.

For a subset $A \subset S$ we set

$$A^h = \{\hat x + tn(\hat x);\ \hat x \in S, -h/2 < t < h/2\}.$$

In particular, the shell is given by

$$S^h = \{\hat x + tn(\hat x);\ \hat x \in S, -h/2 < t < h/2\}.$$

The nearest point retraction of a tubular neighbourhood of S onto S will be denoted by π. Hence

$$\pi(\hat{x}+tn(\hat{x}))=\hat{x} \quad \text{whenever } |t| \text{ is small enough.}$$

After rescaling the ambient space, we may assume that the curvature of S is as small as we please. In particular, we may assume without loss of generality that π is well-defined on a domain containing the closure of $S^1=\{\hat{x}+tn(\hat{x});\ \hat{x}\in S, -1/2<t<1/2\}$, and that

$$1/2<|Id+t\Pi(\hat{x})|<3/2$$

for all $t\in(-1/2,1/2)$ and all $\hat{x}\in S$.

By $r^e: S^1\to\Omega$ we denote the map

$$r^e(x)=r(\pi(x))+(x-\pi(x))\mathbf{e}_3.$$

The variables on ω (resp. Ω) will be denoted by ξ_1,ξ_2 (resp. ξ_1,ξ_2,t). If g is a function on S (resp. S^1), then $\tilde{g}$ denotes the function $\tilde{g}=g\circ r^{-1}$ (resp. the function $\tilde{g}=g\circ(r^e)^{-1}$), unless explicitly stated otherwise.

We introduce the basis vectors of the tangent bundle determined by ψ, namely the push-forwards

$$\tau_i=\psi_* e_i,$$

where e_1, e_2 is the standard basis in $\mathbb{R}^2$. Explicitly, this means

$$\tau_i(\hat{x})=(\partial_i\psi)(r(\hat{x})) \text{ for } i=1,2.$$

By our hypotheses on ψ there exist $\eta_1,\eta_2>0$ such that

$$\eta_1\le\det([\tau_1\ \tau_2]^T[\tau_1\ \tau_2])\le\eta_2,\ \|\tau_1\|_{W^{2,\infty}(S)}\le\eta_2, \|\tau_2\|_{W^{2,\infty}(S)}\le\eta_2. \tag{2}$$

We denote by $(\tau^1(\hat{x}),\tau^2(\hat{x}))$ the dual base to the base $(\tau_1(\hat{x}),\tau_2(\hat{x}))$, that is,

$$\tau^i(\hat{x})=(\partial^i\psi)(r(\hat{x})).$$

Since by definition $\{\tau_1(\hat{x}),\ \tau_2(\hat{x})\}$ span $T_{\hat{x}}S$, for each $\hat{x}\in S$, the vectors $\tau_1(\hat{x}),\tau_2(\hat{x})$ and $n(\hat{x})$ form a basis of $\mathbb{R}^3$. Its dual basis is $(\tau^1(\hat{x}),\tau^2(\hat{x}),n(\hat{x}))$. This motivates defining $\tau_3(\hat{x})=\tau^3(\hat{x})=n(\hat{x})$.
In general, for any vector space V and its base $\{\tau_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and any operator $B:V\to V$ or any $B\in\mathbb{M}(V)$, we have

$$B=\sum_{i,j=1,2}(B\tau_j\cdot\tau_j)\tau^i\otimes\tau^j.$$

Here and in what follows, $\{\tau^i\}_{i=1}^n$ denotes the dual basis to a given basis $\{\tau_i\}_{i=1}^n$.

Clearly,

$$(r^e)^{-1}(\xi_1,\xi_2,t)=\psi(\xi_1,\xi_2)+tn\big(\psi(\xi_1,\xi_2)\big), \tag{3}$$

and thus:

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla(r^e)^{-1}(\xi_1,\xi_2,t) &= (I+t\Pi(x))[\tau_1(x),\tau_2(x),\tau_3(x)], \quad \text{where } x=\psi(\xi_1,\xi_2) \qquad (4)\\ \nabla r^e(x) &= [\tau^1(x),\tau^2(x),\tau^3(x)]^T(I+t\Pi(x))^{-1}. \qquad (5)\end{aligned}$$

With a slight abuse of notation, we also denote by Π also the (negated) second fundamental form of S defined by

$$\Pi_{ij}(\hat{x}):=\Pi(\hat{x})\tau_i(\hat{x})\cdot\tau_j(\hat{x}).$$

In general for a given bilinear form B on S we denote its local coordinates by

$$B_{ij}:=B\tau_j\cdot\tau_i.$$

Obviously $B=\sum_{i,j=1}^2 B_{ij}\tau^i\otimes\tau^j$.

Definition 2.1 (nonlinear material law)**.** Let $0 < \alpha \leq \beta$ and $\rho > 0$. The class $\mathcal{W}(\alpha, \beta, \rho)$ consists of all measurable functions $W : \mathbb{M}^3 \to [0, +\infty]$ that satisfy the following properties:

W is frame indifferent, i.e. (W1)

$$W(RF) = W(F) \qquad \text{for all } F \in \mathbb{M}^3,\ R \in \mathrm{SO}(3);$$

W is non degenerate, i.e. (W2)

$$W(F) \geq \alpha \operatorname{dist}^2(F, \mathrm{SO}(3)) \qquad \text{for all } F \in \mathbb{M}^3;$$

$$W(F) \leq \beta \operatorname{dist}^2(F, \mathrm{SO}(3)) \qquad \text{for all } F \in \mathbb{M}^3 \text{ with } \operatorname{dist}^2(F, \mathrm{SO}(3)) \leq \rho;$$

W is minimal at I, i.e. (W3)

$$W(I) = 0;$$

W admits a quadratic expansion at I, i.e. (W4)

$$W(I + G) = \mathcal{Q}(G) + o(|G|^2) \qquad \text{for all } G \in \mathbb{M}^3$$

where $\mathcal{Q} : \mathbb{M}^3 \to \mathbb{R}$ is a quadratic form.

Definition 2.2 (admissible composite material)**.** Let $0 < \alpha \leq \beta$ and $\rho > 0$. We say

$$W : S^1 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{M}^3 \to \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{+\infty\}$$

describes an admissible composite material of class $\mathcal{W}(\alpha, \beta, \rho)$ if

(i) W is almost everywhere equal to a Borel function on $S^1 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{M}^3$,

(ii) $W(\cdot, y, F)$ is continuous for almost every $y \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $F \in \mathbb{M}^3$,

(iii) $W(x, \cdot, F)$ is Y-periodic for all $x \in \Omega$ and almost every $F \in \mathbb{M}^3$,

(iv) $W(x, y, \cdot) \in \mathcal{W}(\alpha, \beta, \rho)$ for all $x \in S^1$ and almost every $y \in \mathbb{R}^2$.

Assumption 2.3. We assume that

- W describes an admissible composite material of class $\mathcal{W}(\alpha, \beta, \rho)$ in the sense of Definition 2.2.
- $\mathcal{Q}$ is the quadratic energy density associated to W through expansion (W4) in Definition 2.1.

We collect some basic properties of admissible W and the associated quadratic forms $\mathcal{Q}$; a proof can be found in [Neu12, Lemma 2.7].

Lemma 2.4. *Let W and $\mathcal{Q}$ satisfy the assumption (2.3). Then*

(Q1) $\mathcal{Q}(\cdot, y, \cdot)$ *is continuous for almost every* $y \in \mathbb{R}^2$,

(Q2) $\mathcal{Q}(x, \cdot, G)$ *is Y-periodic and measurable for all* $x \in S^1$ *and all* $F \in \mathbb{M}^3$,

(Q3) for all $x \in S^1$ *and almost every* $y \in \mathbb{R}^2$ *the map* $\mathcal{Q}(x, y, \cdot)$ *is quadratic and satisfies*

$$\alpha|\operatorname{sym} G|^2 \leq \mathcal{Q}(x, y, G) = \mathcal{Q}(x, y, \operatorname{sym} G) \leq \beta|\operatorname{sym} G|^2 \qquad \text{for all } G \in \mathbb{M}^3.$$

Furthermore, there exists a monotone function $m : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{+\infty\}$*, only depending on the parameters* α, β *and* ρ*, such that* $m(\delta) \to 0$ *as* $\delta \to 0$ *and*

$$\forall G \in \mathbb{M}^3 \ : \ |W(x, y, I + G) - \mathcal{Q}(x, y, G)| \leq |G|^2 m(|G|) \tag{6}$$

for all $x \in S^1$ *and almost every* $y \in \mathbb{R}^2$.

For a deformation $u^h \in H^1(S^h;\mathbb{R}^3)$ of a thin shell we assume that its elastic energy (scaled per unit thickness) is given by the nonlinear functional

$$E^h(u^h) = \frac{1}{h}\int_{S^h} \bar{W}(x, \tfrac{r(\pi(x))}{\varepsilon(h)}, \nabla u^h)dx,$$

where $\bar{W}(x,\cdot,\cdot) = W(\hat{x} + t/hn(\hat{x}),\cdot,\cdot)$, for some W that satisfies the Assumption 2.3.
We will work under the following hypothesis: A sequence of vector fields $(u^h)_{h>0} \subset H^1(S^h;\mathbb{R}^3)$ and a sequence of positive numbers h satisfy:

$$(\mathbf{H}) \qquad \limsup_{h\to 0} \frac{1}{h^5}\int_{S^h} \bar{W}(x, \tfrac{r(\pi(x))}{\varepsilon(h)}, \nabla u^h) < \infty. \tag{7}$$

We want to discuss the limit, as $h \to 0$, of the functionals E^h/h^4.

We will frequently deal with vector fields $V : S \to \mathbb{R}^3$ on the surface. We extend all such vector fields trivially from S to a neighbourhood of S, simply by defining $V(x) = V(\pi(x))$ for all x. We will denote by $\tilde{V}$ the corresponding vector field along ω, i.e. we set

$$\tilde{V}(\xi) := V(\psi(\xi)) \text{ for all } \xi \in \omega.$$

The tangential part of V is denoted by V_{tan}, so that

$$V_{\text{tan}} = \sum_{i=1}^{2}(V\cdot\tau^i)\tau_i$$

and

$$V = V_{\text{tan}} + (V\cdot n)n.$$

We have

$$(\tilde{V}_{\text{tan}})_i(\xi) = V(\psi(\xi))\cdot(\partial_i\psi)(\xi).$$

We also introduce the quadratic form q_V on S which is defined by its action on tangent vectors $\tau,\eta \in T_{\hat{x}}S$ as follows:

$$q_V(\hat{x})(\tau,\eta) = \tfrac{1}{2}\left(\eta\cdot\partial_\tau V(\hat{x}) + \tau\cdot\partial_\eta V(\hat{x})\right)$$

In the geometry literature, this form is usually denoted by $d\psi\cdot dV$. In local coordinates, it is given by the matrix field

$$\operatorname{sym}\left((\nabla\psi^T)\nabla\tilde{V}\right)$$

on ω. Obviously,

$$\operatorname{sym}\left((\nabla\psi)^T\nabla\tilde{V}_{tan}\right) = \operatorname{sym}\nabla\tilde{V} - \Gamma\cdot\tilde{V}, \tag{8}$$

where for brevity we have set $(\Gamma\cdot\tilde{V})_{ij} := \sum_{k=1,2}\Gamma^k_{ij}\tilde{V}_k$. Here Γ^k_{ij} denote the Christoffel symbols of the metric induced by ψ. For our purposes it will be enough to know that $\Gamma \in L^\infty(\omega;\mathbb{R}^{2\times2\times2})$. Using (8) we see that

$$\operatorname{sym}\left((\nabla\psi)^T\nabla\tilde{V}\right) = \operatorname{sym}\nabla\tilde{V} - \Gamma\cdot\tilde{V} + (V\cdot n)\Pi, \tag{9}$$

were Π denotes the pulled back (negated) second fundamental form. Equivalently, we have the following equality between quadratic forms on S:

$$q_V = q_{V_{\text{tan}}} + (V\cdot n)\Pi. \tag{10}$$

It is well-known that the quadratic form q_V typically arises in the context of thin elastic shells, because it is just the first variation of the metric of S under the displacement V. For example, in [GSP95] it is denoted (in coordinates) by $\gamma_{\alpha\beta}$ and in [LMP10] it is denoted by $\operatorname{sym}\nabla V$.

In order to avoid too much geometric language, we will sometimes regard bilinear forms on S as matrix fields over S. For a given a matrix field $A \in L^2(S, \mathbb{R}^{3\times 3})$, we denote by $A_{\text{tan}}(\hat{x})$ tangential part of A at $\hat{x} \in S$, that is

$$A_{\text{tan}}(\hat{x}) = \sum_{i=1,2} (A(\hat{x})\tau_i(\hat{x}) \cdot \tau_j(\hat{x}))\tau^j(\hat{x}) \otimes \tau^i(\hat{x}).$$

By $A|_{T_{\hat{x}}S}$ we denote the restriction of the matrix field to $T_{\hat{x}}S$, i.e. the bilinear form on S defined by

$$A(\hat{x})|_{T_{\hat{x}}S} = \sum_{i=1,2,3;j=1,2} (A(\hat{x})\tau_j(\hat{x}) \cdot \tau_i(\hat{x}))\tau^i(\hat{x}) \otimes \tau^j(\hat{x}).$$

The lemmas are direct consequences of [FJM02, Theorem 3.1] and of arguments in [FJM06]. We refer to [LMP10] for the straightforward extension to the present setting.

Lemma 2.5. *For each sequence* (u^h) *satisfying* (***H***) *there exist a constant* $C > 0$, *independent of* h, *and a sequence of matrix fields* $(R^h) \subset H^1(S; \mathbb{R}^{3\times 3})$ *such that*

$$R^h(\hat{x}) \in \mathrm{SO}(3), \quad \forall \hat{x} \in S, h > 0,$$

and there exists a sequence of matrices $(Q^h) \subset \mathrm{SO}(3)$ *such that:*

(i) $\limsup_{h\to 0} \frac{1}{h^{5/2}} \|\nabla u^h - R^h \pi\|_{L^2(S^h)} < \infty$

(ii) $\limsup_{h\to 0} \frac{1}{h} \|\nabla R^h\|_{L^2(S)} < \infty$

(iii) $\limsup_{h\to 0} \frac{1}{h} \|(Q^h)^T R^h - I\|_{L^p(S)} < \infty$, *for all* $p \in [1, \infty)$.

(iv) $(Q^h)^T R^h \to I$ *strongly in* H^1.

Moreover, there exists a matrix field $A \in H^1(S, \mathrm{so}(3))$ *taking values in the space of skew symmetric matrices, such that (after passing to subsequences)*

(v) $\frac{1}{h}\big((Q^h)^T R^h - I\big) \rightharpoonup A$, *weakly in* $H^1(S; \mathbb{M}^3)$.

(vi) $\frac{1}{h^2} \operatorname{sym}\big((Q^h)^T R^h - I\big) \to \frac{1}{2}A^2$, *strongly in* $L^p(S; \mathbb{M}^3)$, *for all* $p \in [1, \infty)$.

Following [FJM02] we consider the rescaled versions $y^h \in H^1(S^1; \mathbb{R}^3)$ of u^h given by:

$$y^h(\hat{x} + tn(\hat{x})) = u^h(\hat{x} + thn(\hat{x})) \quad \forall \hat{x} \in S \; \forall t \in I. \tag{11}$$

The advantage is that all y^h have the common domain S^1.
Also define

$$\nabla_h y^h(\hat{x} + tn(\hat{x})) = \nabla u^h(\hat{x} + thn(\hat{x})).$$

For $y \in H^1(S^1; \mathbb{R}^3)$ we define $\hat{y} \in H^1(S \times I; \mathbb{R}^3)$, where $S \times I$ is a product manifold, by:

$$\hat{y}(\hat{x}, t) = y(\hat{x} + tn(\hat{x})). \tag{12}$$

For convenience we define $\partial_n \hat{y} := \partial_t \hat{y} = \partial_n y$. By a straightforward calculation we obtain:

Lemma 2.6. *Let* $y : S^1 \to \mathbb{R}^3$ *be regular enough. Then, for each* $\hat{x} \in S$, *each* $t \in I$, *each* $\tau \in T_{\hat{x}}S$ *and all* $h \in (0, 1]$ *we have*

$$\partial_\tau y^h(\hat{x} + tn(\hat{x})) = \nabla_h y^h(\hat{x} + tn(\hat{x}))(I + th\Pi(\hat{x}))(I + t\Pi(\hat{x}))^{-1}\tau \tag{13}$$

$$\partial_n y^h(\hat{x} + tn(\hat{x})) = h\nabla_h y^h(\hat{x} + tn(\hat{x}))n(\hat{x}) \tag{14}$$

i.e.

$$\nabla y^h(\hat{x} + tn(\hat{x})) = \nabla_h y^h(\hat{x} + tn(\hat{x}))(I_h + th\Pi(\hat{x}))(I + t\Pi(\hat{x}))^{-1}, \tag{15}$$

where

$$I_h\tau=\tau,\ I_h n=hn,\ \forall\tau\in T_{\hat{x}}S.$$

Also we have

$$\nabla\hat{y}=\nabla y(I+t\Pi(\hat{x})). \tag{16}$$

The volume element on the manifold $S\times I$ *denoted by* $dxdt$ *is related to the volume element on the manifold* S^1*, denoted by* dS^1 *in the following way*

$$dS^1=\det(I+t\Pi(\hat{x}))\,\mathrm{d}\hat{x}dt. \tag{17}$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} E^h(u^h) &= \int_{S^1} W(x,\tfrac{r(\pi(x))}{\varepsilon(h)},\nabla_h y^h(x))\det\left[(I+th\Pi)(I+t\Pi)^{-1}\right]\mathrm{d}x \\ &= \int_S\int_I W(\hat{x},t,\tfrac{r(\hat{x})}{\varepsilon(h)},\nabla_h y^h(\hat{x}+tn))\cdot\det\left[I+th\Pi(\hat{x})\right]\mathrm{d}t\,\mathrm{d}\hat{x}. \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

The following identity is also true for an arbitrary $\tau\in T_{\hat{x}}S$

$$\partial_\tau\int_I\hat{y}dt=\int_I\partial_\tau\hat{y}dt. \tag{19}$$

Under the assumption $(\mathbf{H})$ we have that

$$\limsup_{h\to0}\left|\tfrac{1}{h^4}E^h(u^h)-\tfrac{1}{h^4}I^h(y^h)\right|=0, \tag{20}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I^h(y^h) &= \int_{S^1} W(x,\tfrac{r(\pi(x))}{\varepsilon(h)},\nabla_h y^h(x))\det\left[(I+t\Pi)^{-1}\right]\mathrm{d}x \\ &= \int_S\int_I W(\hat{x},t,\tfrac{r(\hat{x})}{\varepsilon(h)},\nabla_h y^h(\hat{x}+tn))\,\mathrm{d}t\,\mathrm{d}\hat{x} \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

A given function $f:S^1\to\mathcal{S}$, for some set $\mathcal{S}$, will sometimes regarded as a function on $(\hat{x},t)\in S\times I$. As for vector fields, we also extend matrix fields trivially to S^1 by the formula $R^h(x)=R^h(\pi(x))$.

Lemma 2.7. *Assume that* $(\mathbf{H})$ *is satisfied and let* A *be as in Lemma 2.5. Then the following are true:*

(i) $\limsup_{h\to0}\frac{1}{h^2}\|\nabla_h y^h-R^h\|_{L^2(S^1)}<\infty$.

(ii) $\frac{1}{h}\big((Q^h)^T\nabla_h y^h-I\big)\rightharpoonup A$*, weakly in* H^1 *up to a subsequence.*

Set $\bar{y}^h\in H^1(S^1;\mathbb{R}^3)$ *and averaged displacements*

$$\bar{y}^h=(Q^h)^Ty^h-c^h,\quad V^h([\bar{y}^h])=\frac{1}{h}\int_I\big(\bar{y}^h(\hat{x}+tn(\hat{x}))-\hat{x}\big)dt, \tag{22}$$

where $c^h=⨍_S\int_I\big((Q^h)^Ty^h-\hat{x}\big)\,\mathrm{d}t\,\mathrm{d}\hat{x}$*, so that* $⨍_S V^h=0$*. Then (after passing to a subsequence)*

(iii) $\bar{y}^h\to\pi$*, strongly in* $H^1(S^1;\mathbb{R}^3)$.

(iv) $V^h\to V$*, strongly in* $H^1(S;\mathbb{R}^3)$.

(v) $\frac{1}{h}q_{V^h}$ *is bounded in* $L^2(S;\mathbb{M}^3)$.

The vector field V *in (iv) belongs to* $H^2(S;\mathbb{R}^3)$*, and it satisfies* $\partial_\tau V(x)=A(x)\tau$ *for all* $\tau\in T_{\hat{x}}S$.

Remark 1. (i) In what follows we replace the sequence R^h by $(Q^h)^T R^h$ and the sequence y^h by $\bar{y}^h$, so that we may assume without loss of generality that $Q^h = Id$.

(ii) The vector field V is an *infinitesimal bending* of S. This means that $q_V = 0$, i.e., that

$$\operatorname{sym}\left((\nabla\psi)^T\nabla\tilde{V}\right)_{ij} = \partial_j\psi\cdot\partial_i\tilde{V} + \partial_i\psi\cdot\partial_j\tilde{V} = 0 \text{ for all } i,j = 1,2.$$

Infinitesimal bendings have been studied extensively both in the applied literature (see e.g. [Cia00], [Cho97], [GSP95]) and in the geometry literature (see e.g. the references in [Hor12]).

(iii) An infinitesimal bending V determines a linearized second fundamental form b_V, which can be regarded as the first order change of the second fundamental form of the surface ψ under the displacement V. In coordinates, the (negated) linearized second fundamental form of V is given by

$$(b_V)_{ij} = n\cdot(\partial_i\partial_j\tilde{V} - \Gamma_{ij}^k\partial_k\tilde{V}),$$

where Γ_{ij}^k are the Christoffel symbols of the metric induced by ψ, cf. [Hor12] and the references therein. The linearized second fundamental form also occurs e.g. in the analysis in [GSP95]. We will encounter the linearized second fundamental form in following guise:

$$b_V = \left(A\Pi - \nabla(An)\right)_{\tan}. \tag{23}$$

Note that, in particular, the right-hand side is a quadratic form (i.e. it is symmetric).

(iv) The quantity A^2 occuring in Lemma 2.5 is just the quadratic form $(dV)^2$ on S, which in coordinates is given by

$$\left((\nabla\tilde{V})^T(\nabla\tilde{V})\right)_{ij} = \partial_i\tilde{V}\cdot\partial_j\tilde{V}.$$

Proof of formula (23). In this proof we write V instead of $\tilde{V}$ and n instead of $\tilde{n}$, and we set $a_{ij} = n\cdot\partial_i\partial_j\psi$. By the Weingarten formula we have

$$(A\Pi)_{ij} = \partial_i\psi\cdot(A\Pi)\partial_j\psi = \partial_i\psi\cdot(A\partial_j n) = -\partial_i V\cdot\partial_j n = a_j^k\partial_i\psi\cdot\partial_k V, \tag{24}$$

where we use the common convention regarding the raising and lowering of indices. On the other hand,

$$An = -n\cdot dV,$$

because by skew symmetry of A we have $\partial_i\psi\cdot An = -n\cdot A\partial_i\psi = -n\cdot\partial_i V$.

Hence a short computation shows

$$\begin{aligned}
-\left(\nabla(An)\right)_{ij} &= -\partial_i\psi\cdot\partial_{\partial_j\psi}(An)\\
&= a_j^k\partial_k\psi\cdot\partial_i V + n\cdot\partial_j\partial_i V + (n\cdot\partial_k V)\partial_j\partial^k\psi\cdot\partial_i\psi.\\
&= a_j^k\partial_k\psi\cdot\partial_i V + n\cdot\left(\partial_j\partial_i V - \Gamma_{ij}^k\partial_k V\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Adding this to (24) shows

$$(A\Pi)_{ij} - \left(\nabla(An)\right)_{ij} = a_j^k\left(\partial_i\psi\cdot\partial_k V + \partial_k\psi\cdot\partial_i V\right) + (b_V)_{ij}.$$

The first two term cancels because V is an infinitesimal bending. ☐

Next we modify the vector field V^h into a more regular V_s^h which still enjoys a similar compactness.

Corollary 2.8. *If* (**H**) *is satisfied and* y^h, V^h *are as above, then*

$$\limsup_{h\to 0}\frac{1}{h}\left\|\nabla V^h - \frac{R^h - I}{h}\Big|_{T_{\hat{x}}S}\right\|_{L^2} < \infty. \tag{25}$$

Moreover, there exists $V_s^h \in H^2(S;\mathbb{R}^3)$ *such that* *(i)* $\limsup_{h\to 0} \frac{1}{h} \left\| \left| \nabla V_s^h - \frac{R^h - I}{h} \right|_{T_x S} \right\|_{L^2} < \infty.$

(ii) the sequence $(V_s^h)_{h>0}$ *is bounded in* $H^2(S;\mathbb{R}^3)$ *and weakly converges to* V*, up to a subsequence.*

(iii) $\fint_S V_s^h = 0, \limsup_{h\to 0} \frac{1}{h} \| V_s^h - V^h \|_{H^1} < \infty.$

Proof. As in [NV, Proposition 3.1], we note that for given $p \in H^1(\tilde{\omega}, \mathbb{R}^2)$, the Euler-Lagrange equation associated with the variational problem

$$\min_{\substack{v \in H^1(\tilde{\omega}) \\ \int_\omega v = 0}} \int_{\tilde{\omega}} |\hat{\nabla} v - p|^2 \, d\hat{x}$$

is

$$\begin{cases} -\triangle v = \ -\nabla \cdot p & \text{in } \tilde{\omega} \\ \partial_\nu v = p \cdot \nu & \text{on } \partial\tilde{\omega}, \end{cases}$$

subject to $\int_{\tilde{\omega}} v \, dx = 0$. Above, ν denotes the normal on $\partial\tilde{\omega}$. Since $\nabla \cdot p \in L^2$, we obtain by standard regularity estimates that $v \in H^2(\tilde{\omega})$ under the assumption that $\partial\tilde{\omega}$ is $C^{1,1}$. In this case, $||v||_{H^2(\tilde{\omega})} \lesssim ||\nabla \cdot p||_{L^2(\tilde{\omega})} + ||p||_{L^2(\tilde{\omega})}$.
Note that $V^h = \frac{1}{h} \int_I \big(\hat{y}(x,t) - x\big) dt$. The inequality (25) follows from (13), (15), (19), (i) and (ii) in Lemma 2.7. As usual, we denote by $\tilde{V}^h \in H^1(\omega;\mathbb{R}^3)$ the map $\tilde{V}^h = V^h \circ \psi$. By (25) we conclude that

$$\limsup_{h\to 0} \frac{1}{h} \left\| \nabla \tilde{V}^h - \frac{R^h - I}{h} \nabla(r^{-1}) \right\|_{L^2} < \infty. \tag{26}$$

We take p to be the i-th row of the matrix $\frac{R^h - I}{h} \nabla\psi$ for i=1,2,3. We define $\tilde{V}_s^h \in H^2(\tilde{\omega};\mathbb{R}^3)$ such that $(\tilde{V}_s^h)_i$ is the solution of the minimization problem mentioned at the beginning of the proof. Due to the fact that $\tilde{V}_s^h$ is the solution of the minimization problem we have that

$$\limsup_{h\to 0} \frac{1}{h} \left\| \nabla \tilde{V}_s^h - \frac{R^h - I}{h} \nabla\psi \right\|_{L^2} < \infty, \tag{27}$$

as the consequence of (26). Also from the elliptic estimate and from (v) in Lemma 2.5, we have that $\{\tilde{V}_s^h\}_{h>0}$ is bounded in $H^2(\omega;\mathbb{R}^3)$. Now we define $V_s^h := \tilde{V}_s^h \circ r$. Then V_s^h obviously satisfies (i) and (ii) of the Lemma. Item (iii) is easily obtained by adding a suitable constant for each h. ☐

Definition 2.9 (two-scale convergence). We say that a sequence $g^h \in L^2(S^1)$, weakly two-scale converges in L^2 to the function $g \in L^2(S^1, L^2(\mathcal{Y}))$ as $h \to 0$, if the sequence g^h is bounded in $L^2(S^1)$ and

$$\lim_{h\to 0} \int_{S^1} g^h(x) \, \psi(x, \tfrac{r(\pi(x))}{\varepsilon(h)}) \, \mathrm{d}x = \iint_{S^1 \times \mathcal{Y}} g(x,y) \, \psi(x,y) \, \mathrm{d}y \, \mathrm{d}x$$

for all $\psi \in C_c^\infty(S^1, C(\mathcal{Y}))$. We say that g^h strongly two-scale converges to g if additionally

$$\lim_{h\to 0} ||g^h||_{L^2(S^1)} = ||g||_{L^2(S^1 \times Y)}.$$

Remark 2. It can be seen that the notion of two-scale convergence is equivalent to the following:

$$\lim_{h\to 0} \int_\Omega g^h((r^e)^{-1}(\xi,t)) \, \psi(\xi, t, \tfrac{\xi}{\varepsilon(h)}) \, \mathrm{d}\xi = \iint_{\Omega\times\mathcal{Y}} g((r^e)^{-1}(\xi,t), y) \, \psi(\xi,y) \, \mathrm{d}y \, \mathrm{d}\xi$$

for any $\psi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega; C^\infty(\mathcal{Y}))$.

If the meaning is clear from the context, we shall simply write $g^h \overset{2,\gamma}{\rightharpoonup} g$ in L^2 (resp. $g^h \xrightarrow{2,\gamma} g$ in L^2) for weak (resp. strong) two-scale convergence in L^2.

For the basic properties of two-scale convergence we refer to [Ngu89, All92, Vis06]. It can be shown that if $g^h \overset{2,\gamma}{\rightharpoonup} g$ then we have $g^h \rightharpoonup \int_{\mathcal{Y}} g(\cdot, y)dy$. Also it can be shown that if g^h is bounded in $L^2(S^1)$ then it has subsequence which weakly two scale converges to some $g \in L^2(S^1; L^2(\mathcal{Y}))$. By the extension in the normal direction one can define two scale convergence on the manifold S. We shall sometimes write the two scale limit $g \in L^2(S^1 \times \mathcal{Y})$ in the coordinates $(\hat{x}, t, y)$ e.g. see Lemma 3.3.

The following lemma summarizes the standard results about two scale and adapts them to a possibly curved surface.

Lemma 2.10. *(i) if $(g^h)_{h>0} \subset H^1(S^1)$ is bounded, then there exist $g_0 \in H^1(S^1)$ and $g_1 \in L^2(S^1; \dot{H}^1(\mathcal{Y}))$ such that, after passing to a subsequence, $\nabla g^h \overset{2,\gamma}{\rightharpoonup} g$, where*

$$g = \nabla g_0 + \nabla_y g_1(x, y).$$

(ii) if $(g^h)_{h>0} \subset H^2(S^1; \mathbb{R}^3)$ bounded, then there exist $g_0 \in H^2(S^1)$ and $g_1 \in L^2(S^1; \dot{H}^2(\mathcal{Y}))$ such that, after passing to a subsequence,

$$\nabla^2 g^h \overset{2,\gamma}{\rightharpoonup} g,$$

where

$$g = \nabla^2 g_0 + \sum_{j,k\leq 2} \big(\partial^2_{y_j y_k} g_1(x, y)\big)\tau^j \otimes \tau^k.$$

(iii) if $\{g^h\}_{h>0}$ bounded in $H^1(S^1; \mathbb{R}^3)$ then we have $\nabla g^h \overset{2,\gamma}{\rightharpoonup} g$, on a subsequence, and there exist $g_0 \in H^1(S^1; \mathbb{R}^3)$ and $g_1 \in L^2(S^1; \dot{H}^1(\mathcal{Y}; \mathbb{R}^3))$ such that

$$g = \nabla g_0 + \sum_{i\leq 3; j\leq 2} \big(\nabla_y g_1(x, y)\big)_{ij} \tau^i \otimes \tau^j.$$

(iv) if $\{g^h\}_{h>0}$ bounded in $H^2(S^1; \mathbb{R}^3)$ then we have $\nabla^2 g^h \overset{2,\gamma}{\rightharpoonup} g$, on a subsequence, and there exist $g_0 \in H^2(S^1; \mathbb{R}^3)$ and $g_1 \in L^2(S^1; \dot{H}^2(\mathcal{Y}; \mathbb{R}^3))$ such that

$$g = \nabla^2 g_0 + \sum_{i\leq 3; j,k\leq 2} \big(\partial^2_{y_j y_k} g_{1,i}(x, y)\big)\tau^i \otimes \tau^j \otimes \tau^k$$

Proof. The proof follows easily from the analogous statements for the planar case. For the planar versions of (ii) and (iv) we refer to [Vel, Lemma 3]. ☐

3 Compactness and lower bound

We denote by $\mathcal{B}$ the L^2-closure of the set

$$\{q_w : w \in H^1(S; \mathbb{R}^3)\}.$$

Of course, both strong and weak L^2-convergence yield the same set $\mathcal{B}$. The set $\mathcal{B}$ is a closed linear subspace of $L^2(S; \mathbb{M}^2_{\mathrm{sym}}(TS))$. The space $\mathcal{B}$ is also encountered in the context of shell models derived from linearized elasticity; see [SP89a, SP89b, GSP95] for details.

Next we will identify the space of possible two scale limits of symmetrized gradients. The following auxiliary result is standard in the planar case, and it can be easily derived, e.g., using Fourier transforms.

Lemma 3.1. *Let us suppose that* $B \in L^2(S; L^2(\mathcal{Y}; \mathbb{M}^2_{\mathrm{sym}}(TS)))$*, such that for every*

$$\Psi \in C_0^\infty(\omega; C^\infty(\mathcal{Y}; \mathbb{M}^2_{\mathrm{sym}}))$$

which satisfies

$$\Psi_{11} = \psi(\xi)\partial^2_{y_2 y_2} F(y),\ \Psi_{12} = -\psi(\xi)\partial^2_{y_1 y_2} F(y),\ \Psi_{22} = \psi(\xi)\partial^2_{y_1 y_1} F(y), \tag{28}$$

for some $\psi \in C_c^\infty(\omega)$*,* $F \in C^\infty(\mathcal{Y})$ *such that* $\int_{\mathcal{Y}} F(y)\,\mathrm{d}y = 0$*,*

we have that

$$\iint_{S\times\mathcal{Y}} B(\hat{x}, y) \cdot \big(\sum_{i,j=1,2} \Psi_{ij}(r(\hat{x}), y)\tau_i(\hat{x}) \otimes \tau_j(\hat{x})\big)\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}\hat{x} = 0.$$

Then there exist unique $B \in L^2(S; \mathbb{M}^2_{\mathrm{sym}}(TS))$ *and* $w \in L^2(S; \dot{H}^1(\mathcal{Y}; \mathbb{R}^2))$ *such that*

$$B(\hat{x}, y) = B(\hat{x}) + \sum_{i,j=1,2} (\operatorname{sym} \nabla_y w(\hat{x}, y))_{ij} \tau^i(\hat{x}) \otimes \tau^j(\hat{x}).$$

In what follows, we will use the notation $\xrightharpoonup{osc,\gamma}$ introduced in the appendix. For variety, we state and prove the next proposition in local coordinates; of course, this is equivalent to performing computations on the level of the surface.

Proposition 3.2. *Let* (w^h) *be a bounded sequence in* $H^2(\omega; \mathbb{R}^3)$ *such that*

$$\tfrac{1}{h} \operatorname{sym}\big((\nabla\psi)^T \nabla w^h\big)$$

is bounded in $L^2(\omega; \mathbb{R}^{2\times 2})$*. Then there exist* $w_0 \in H^2(\omega)$*,* $w_1 \in L^2(\omega; H^2(\mathcal{Y}; \mathbb{R}^3))$ *and* $B \in L^2(\omega \times Y; \mathbb{R}^{2\times 2}_{\mathrm{sym}})$ *such that, after passing to a subsequence,*

$$\nabla^2 w^h \xrightharpoonup{2,\gamma} \nabla^2 w_0 + \nabla_y^2 w_1$$

and

$$\tfrac{1}{h} \operatorname{sym}\big((\nabla\psi)^T \nabla w^h\big) \xrightharpoonup{2,\gamma} B.$$

Set $B_w = \int_Y B(\cdot, y)\,\mathrm{d}y$*. Then the following are true:*

(i) If $\varepsilon \gg h \gg \varepsilon^2$ *then there exists a unique* $v \in L^2(\omega; \dot{H}^1(\mathcal{Y}; \mathbb{R}^2))$ *such that*

$$B = B_w + \operatorname{sym} \nabla_y v.$$

(ii) If $h \sim \varepsilon^2$ *and if we set* $\lim_{h\to 0} \frac{\varepsilon(h)^2}{h} = \frac{1}{\gamma_1}$*, then there exists a unique* $v \in L^2(\omega; \dot{H}^1(\mathcal{Y}; \mathbb{R}^2))$ *such that*

$$B = B_w + \operatorname{sym} \nabla_y v + \frac{1}{\gamma_1}(w_1 \cdot n)\Pi$$

(iii) If $h \ll \varepsilon^2$*, then there exists a unique* $v \in L^2(\omega; \dot{H}^1(\mathcal{Y}; \mathbb{R}^2))$ *such that*

$$\operatorname{sym} \nabla_y v + (w_1 \cdot n)\Pi = 0.$$

Proof. The existence of w_0 and w_1 is standard. Define $\tilde{w}$ by setting $(\tilde{w}_1)_i = w_1 \cdot \partial_i u$. We claim that if $h \ll \varepsilon$ then $\tilde{w}_1 = 0$. In fact, by the results in the appendix,

$$\frac{\operatorname{sym} \nabla \tilde{w}^h}{\varepsilon} \xrightharpoonup{osc,\gamma} \operatorname{sym} \nabla_y \tilde{w}_1 \tag{29}$$

and

$$\frac{w^h}{\varepsilon^2} \xrightharpoonup{osc,\gamma} w_1. \tag{30}$$

Note, however, that

$$\frac{q^h}{\varepsilon} \to 0 \text{ strongly in } L^2$$

because $\frac{q^h}{h}$ is bounded in L^2 and $h \ll \varepsilon$, and that

$$\frac{w^h}{\varepsilon} \overset{osc,\gamma}{\rightharpoonup} 0$$

because w^h is strongly precompact in H^1. Hence

$$\frac{q^h_{tan}}{\varepsilon} = \frac{q^h}{\varepsilon} - \frac{w^h}{\varepsilon}\Pi \overset{osc,\gamma}{\rightharpoonup} 0$$

and similarly

$$\frac{\operatorname{sym} \nabla \tilde{w}^h}{\varepsilon} \overset{osc,\gamma}{\rightharpoonup} 0.$$

Thus (29) implies that $\operatorname{sym} \nabla_y \tilde{w}_1 = 0$. Hence Korn's inequality and the known properties of $\tilde{w}_1$ imply that $\tilde{w}_1 = 0$.
Now let $F \in C^\infty(\mathcal{Y})$ and $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\omega)$.

With (8) in mind, we compute:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_\omega \operatorname{sym} \nabla \tilde{w}^h : (\operatorname{cof} \nabla^2 F)\left(\frac{\cdot}{\varepsilon}\right)\varphi \\
&= \varepsilon^2 \int_\omega \operatorname{sym} \nabla \tilde{w}^h : \operatorname{cof}\left[\nabla^2\left(F\left(\frac{\cdot}{\varepsilon}\right)\varphi\right) - \frac{2}{\varepsilon}(\nabla F)\left(\frac{\cdot}{\varepsilon}\right) \otimes \nabla\varphi - F\left(\frac{\cdot}{\varepsilon}\right)\nabla^2\varphi\right] \\
&= -\varepsilon^2 \int_\omega \operatorname{sym} \nabla \tilde{w}^h : \operatorname{cof}\left[\frac{2}{\varepsilon}(\nabla F)\left(\frac{\cdot}{\varepsilon}\right) \otimes \nabla\varphi + F\left(\frac{\cdot}{\varepsilon}\right)\nabla^2\varphi\right].
\end{aligned}$$

We used that the term $\operatorname{sym} \nabla \tilde{w}$ is L^2-orthogonal to test matrix fields of the form $\operatorname{cof} \nabla^2 f$. From this and from (8) and (30) we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_\omega \frac{q^h_{tan}}{\varepsilon^2} : (\operatorname{cof} \nabla^2 F)\left(\frac{\cdot}{\varepsilon}\right)\varphi \\
&= -\int_\omega \frac{\operatorname{sym} \nabla \tilde{w}^h}{\varepsilon} : \operatorname{cof}\left[2(\nabla F)\left(\frac{\cdot}{\varepsilon}\right) \otimes \nabla\varphi + \varepsilon F\left(\frac{\cdot}{\varepsilon}\right)\nabla^2\varphi\right] - \int_\omega \frac{\Gamma \cdot \tilde{w}^h}{\varepsilon^2} : (\operatorname{cof} \nabla^2 F)\left(\frac{\cdot}{\varepsilon}\right)\varphi \\
&\to -\int_{\omega \times Y} \left[\operatorname{sym}_y \nabla w_1(\cdot, y) : \operatorname{cof}\left[2(\nabla F)(y) \otimes \nabla\varphi\right] + (\Gamma \cdot w_1(\cdot, y)) : (\operatorname{cof} \nabla^2 F)(y)\,\varphi\right].
\end{aligned}$$

This is zero because $w_1 = 0$.

Using (9) and (30), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{h\to 0} \int_\omega \frac{q^h}{\varepsilon^2} : (\operatorname{cof} \nabla^2 F)\left(\frac{\cdot}{\varepsilon}\right)\varphi &= \lim_{h\to 0} \int_\omega \left(\frac{w^h}{\varepsilon^2} \cdot n\right)\Pi : (\operatorname{cof} \nabla^2 F)\left(\frac{\cdot}{\varepsilon}\right)\varphi \\
&= \int_{\omega \times Y} (w_1(\cdot, y) \cdot n)\Pi : (\operatorname{cof} \nabla^2 F)(y)\varphi.
\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

In cases (i) and (ii) we therefore have

$$\int_\omega \frac{q^h}{h} : (\operatorname{cof} \nabla^2 F)\left(\frac{\cdot}{\varepsilon}\right)\varphi \to \left(\lim_{h\to 0} \frac{\varepsilon^2}{h}\right) \int_{\omega \times Y} (w_1(\cdot, y) \cdot n)\Pi : (\operatorname{cof} \nabla^2 F)(y)\varphi.$$

Hence Lemma 3.1 shows that there exists v such that

$$\frac{q^h}{h} \overset{2,\gamma}{\rightharpoonup} B_w + \operatorname{sym} \nabla_y v + \left(\lim_{h\to 0} \frac{\varepsilon^2}{h}\right)(w_1 \cdot n)\Pi.$$

This concludes the proofs of cases (i) and (ii).

For the case (iii) we argue differently: then we know that $q^h/\varepsilon^2 \to 0$ strongly in L^2. Hence the left-hand side of (31) converges to zero, so

$$\int_{\omega\times Y} (w_1(\cdot,y)\cdot n)\Pi : (\operatorname{cof}\nabla^2 F)(y)\varphi = 0,$$

which by Lemma 3.1 implies the claim. □

Lemma 3.3. *Let* $(w^h)_{h>0} \subset H^1(S^1;\mathbb{R}^3)$ *be such that*

$$\limsup_{h\to 0} \left(\|w^h\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla_h w^h\|_{L^2} \right) < \infty.$$

Then there exists a map $w_0 \in H^1(S;\mathbb{R}^3)$ *and a field* $H_\gamma \in L(S\times I\times\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{M}^3)$ *such that*

$$H_\gamma = \begin{cases} \displaystyle\sum_{i,j=1}^{3} \left(\hat\nabla_y w_1, w_2\right)\tau^i\otimes\tau^j & \text{for some } \left\{\begin{array}{l} w_1 \in L^2(S;\dot H^1(\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{R}^3)) \\ w_2 \in L^2(S\times Y\times I;\mathbb{R}^3)) \end{array}\right\} \\ & \text{if } \gamma = 0, \\ \displaystyle\sum_{i,j=1}^{3} \left(\hat\nabla_y w_1, \tfrac{1}{\gamma}\partial_3 w_1\right)\tau^i\otimes\tau^j & \text{for some } w_1 \in L^2(S,\dot H^1(I\times\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{R}^3)) \\ & \text{if } \gamma \in (0,\infty), \\ \displaystyle\sum_{i,j=1}^{3} \left(\hat\nabla_y w_1, w_2\right)\tau^i\otimes\tau^j & \text{for some } \left\{\begin{array}{l} w_1 \in L^2(S\times I;\dot H^1(\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{R}^3)) \\ w_2 \in L^2(S\times I;\mathbb{R}^3)) \end{array}\right\} \\ & \text{if } \gamma = \infty, \end{cases} \tag{32}$$

such that, up to a subsequence, $w^h \to w_0$ *in* L^2 *and*

$$\nabla_h w^h \xrightarrow{2,\gamma} \hat\nabla w_0(I - n\otimes n) + H_\gamma \qquad \textit{weakly two-scale in } L^2.$$

Here, w_0 *is defined by*

$$w_0(\hat x) = \int_I \hat w^h(\hat x, t)dt. \tag{33}$$

Proof. The lemma is an analogue of Proposition 6.3.5 in [Neu10], adapted to the manifold S^1 and the definition of two scale convergence on the manifold. Thus we will only prove the case $\gamma \in (0,\infty)$. Since the sequence is bounded in H^1 norm there exists a weak limit $w_0 \in H^1(S^1;\mathbb{R}^3)$. Let us denote by $\tilde w^h$, $\tilde w_0$ the elements of $H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^3)$, defined by:

$$\tilde w^h = w^h \circ (r^e)^{-1}, \quad \tilde w_0 = w_0 \circ (r^e)^{-1}. \tag{34}$$

By the Proposition 6.3.5 in [Neu10], which is proved for planar domains, $\tilde w_0$ does not depend on t and there exists $\tilde w_1 \in L^2(\omega;H^1(I\times\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{R}^3))$ such that:

$$\nabla_h \tilde w^h \xrightarrow{2,\gamma} (\nabla_\xi \tilde w_0, 0) + (\nabla_y \tilde w_1, \tfrac{1}{\gamma}\partial_t \tilde w_1). \tag{35}$$

Here we have denoted $\nabla_h \tilde w^h := (\nabla_\xi \tilde w^h, \frac{1}{h}\partial_t \tilde w^h)$. Let us define $\breve w_1 := \tilde w_1 \circ r^e$. Then we have that $\breve w_1 \in L^2(S;H^1(I\times\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{R}^3))$. Using (4) and (15) we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_h w^h &= \nabla w^h (I + t\Pi)(I_h + th\Pi)^{-1} \\ &= \nabla \tilde w^h [\tau^1,\tau^2,\tau^3]^T (I+t\Pi)^{-1}(I+t\Pi)(I_h+th\Pi)^{-1} \\ &= \nabla_h \tilde w^h [\tau^1,\tau^2,\tau^3]^T (I+th\Pi)^{-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

By using (35) we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_h w^h \quad &\overset{2,\gamma}{\rightharpoonup} \quad \Big((\hat\nabla_\xi \tilde w_0)\circ r, 0\Big)\,[\tau^1,\tau^2,\tau^3]^T + (\nabla_y \breve w_1, \tfrac{1}{\gamma}\partial_t \breve w_1)[\tau^1,\tau^2,\tau^3]^T \\ &= \quad \hat\nabla w_0 (I - n\otimes n) + \sum_{i,j=1}^3 (\nabla_y w_1, \tfrac{1}{\gamma}\partial_t w_1)_{ij}\tau^i\otimes\tau^j,\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

where $(w_1)_i = \breve w_1 \cdot \tau_i$. The last property follows from the fact that $\tilde w_0$ does not depend on t. ☐

The following definition is important for defining the relaxation fields.

Definition 3.4. For $\hat x \in S$ we define the following operators

$$\mathcal{U}_0 : \dot H^1(\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{R}^2)\times L^2(I\times\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{R}^3) \to L^2(I\times\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{M}^3_{\rm sym}),$$

$$\mathcal{U}_0(\zeta,g) = \left\{ \sum_{i,j=1}^3 M_{ij}\tau^i\otimes\tau^j \ : M = \begin{pmatrix} \begin{array}{c|c} \operatorname{sym}\hat\nabla_y\zeta & \begin{array}{c} g_1 \\ g_2 \end{array} \\ (g_1,\ g_2) & g_3 \end{array}\end{pmatrix} \right\},$$

$$\mathcal{U}_0^0 : \dot H^1(\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{R}^2)\times \dot H^2(\mathcal{Y})\times L^2(I\times\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{R}^3) \to L^2(I\times\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{M}^3_{\rm sym}),$$

$$\mathcal{U}_0^0(\zeta,\varphi,g) = \left\{ \sum_{i,j=1}^3 M_{ij}\tau^i\otimes\tau^j \ : M = \begin{pmatrix} \begin{array}{c|c} \operatorname{sym}\hat\nabla_y\zeta - t\hat\nabla_y^2\varphi & \begin{array}{c} g_1 \\ g_2 \end{array} \\ (g_1,\ g_2) & g_3 \end{array}\end{pmatrix} \right\},$$

$$\mathcal{U}_0^{1,\gamma_1} : \dot H^1(\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{R}^2)\times \dot H^2(\mathcal{Y})\times L^2(I\times\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{R}^3) \to L^2(I\times\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{M}^3_{\rm sym}),$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{U}_0^{1,\gamma_1}(\zeta,\varphi,g) = \Bigg\{ &\sum_{i,j=1}^3 M_{ij}\tau^i\otimes\tau^j \ : \\ &M = \begin{pmatrix} \begin{array}{c|c} \operatorname{sym}\hat\nabla_y\zeta + \frac{1}{\gamma_1}\varphi\Pi(\hat x) - t\hat\nabla_y^2\varphi & \begin{array}{c} g_1 \\ g_2 \end{array} \\ (g_1,\ g_2) & g_3 \end{array}\end{pmatrix} \Bigg\},\end{aligned}$$

$$\mathcal{U}_\infty : L^2(I;\dot H^1(\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{R}^2))\times L^2(I;\dot H^1(\mathcal{Y}))\times L^2(I;\mathbb{R}^3) \to L^2(I\times\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{M}^3_{\rm sym}),$$

$$\mathcal{U}_\infty(\zeta,\psi,c) = \left\{ \sum_{i,j=1}^3 M_{ij}\tau^i\otimes\tau^j \ : M = \begin{pmatrix} \begin{array}{c|c} \operatorname{sym}\hat\nabla_y\zeta & \begin{array}{c} \partial_{y_1}\psi + c_1 \\ \partial_{y_2}\psi + c_2 \end{array} \\ \hat\nabla_y\psi + (c_1,c_2) & c_3 \end{array}\end{pmatrix} \right\},$$

$$\mathcal{U}_\gamma : \dot H^1(I\times\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{R}^3) \to L^2(I\times\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{M}^3_{\rm sym});\ \text{for } \gamma\in(0,\infty);$$

$$\mathcal{U}_\gamma(\phi) = \Big\{ \sum_{i,j=1}^3 M_{ij}\tau^i\otimes\tau^j \ : M = \operatorname{sym}(\hat\nabla_y\phi, \tfrac{1}{\gamma}\partial_3\phi)\Big\},$$

and function spaces of *relaxation fields*

$$\begin{aligned}&L_\gamma(I\times\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{M}^3_{\rm sym}) := \mathfrak{Im}\,\mathcal{U}_\gamma,\ \text{for } \gamma\in[0,\infty],\ L_0^0(I\times\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{M}^3_{\rm sym}) := \mathfrak{Im}\,\mathcal{U}_0^0,; \\ &L_0^{1,\gamma_1} = \mathfrak{Im}\,\mathcal{U}_0^{1,\gamma_1},\ \text{for } \gamma_1\in(0,\infty)\end{aligned}$$

where by $\mathfrak{Im}$ we have denoted the range of the operator.

Remark 3. It is easy to see, by using Korn's inequality, that $L_\gamma(I\times\mathcal{Y},\mathbb{M}^3_{\rm sym})$ as well as $L_0^0(I\times\mathcal{Y},\mathbb{M}^3_{\rm sym})$, $L_0^{1,\gamma_1}(I\times\mathcal{Y},\mathbb{M}^3_{\rm sym})$ for $\gamma\in[0,\infty]$ and $\gamma_1\in(0,\infty)$ are closed subspaces of $L^2(I\times\mathcal{Y},\mathbb{M}^3_{\rm sym})$. Also by using Korn's inequality it is easy to see (see also [Neu12, Neu10, NV]) that the following coercivity bounds are satisfied:

$$\begin{aligned}\|\zeta\|_{H^1}^2+\|g\|_{L^2}^2 &\lesssim \|\mathcal{U}_0(\zeta,g)\|_{L^2}^2,\\ &\quad \forall\zeta\in\dot{H}^1(\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{R}^2), g\in L^2(I\times\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{R}^3),\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\|\zeta\|_{H^1}^2+\|\varphi\|_{H^2}+\|g\|_{L^2}^2 &\lesssim \|\mathcal{U}_0^0(\zeta,\varphi,g)\|_{L^2}^2,\\ &\quad \forall\zeta\in\dot{H}^1(\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{R}^2), \varphi\in\dot{H}^2(\mathcal{Y}), g\in L^2(I\times\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{R}^3) \text{ and}\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\|\zeta\|_{H^1}^2+\|\varphi\|_{H^2}+\|g\|_{L^2}^2 &\lesssim \|\mathcal{U}_0^{1,\gamma_1}(\zeta,\varphi,g)\|_{L^2}^2,\\ &\quad \forall\zeta\in\dot{H}^1(\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{R}^2), \varphi\in\dot{H}^2(\mathcal{Y}), g\in L^2(I\times\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{R}^3) \text{ and } \gamma_1\in(0,\infty)\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\|\zeta\|_{H^1}^2+\|\psi\|_{H^1}+\|c\|_{L^2}^2 &\lesssim \|\mathcal{U}_\infty(\zeta,\psi,c)\|_{L^2}^2,\\ &\quad \forall\zeta\in\dot{H}^1(\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{R}^2), \psi\in L^2(I;\dot{H}^1(\mathcal{Y})), c\in L^2(I;\mathbb{R}^3),\end{aligned}$$

$$\|\phi\|_{H^1}^2 \leq C(\gamma)\|\mathcal{U}_\gamma(\phi)\|_{L^2}^2,\ \forall\phi\in\dot{H}^1(I\times\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{R}^3).$$

Here the constant absorbed into the symbol $\lesssim$ depends on η_1,η_2.

Remark 4. Notice that when $\Pi=0$ then all spaces L_0^0 and L_0^{1,γ_1} coincide for $\gamma_1\in(0,\infty)$. This corresponds to the observation in the von Kármán plate theory that for $\gamma=0$ one obtains only one relaxation space, cf. [NV] for details.

The following lemma is fairly straightforward; we refer to [Neu10, Corollary 2.3.4] for a proof.

Lemma 3.5. *Let $(E^h_{app})\subset L^2(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{d\times d})$ be such that*

$$E^h_{app}\overset{2,\gamma}{\rightharpoonup} E_{app} \text{ in } L^2(\Omega\times\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{M}^d).$$

Then

$$\frac{\sqrt{(I+h^2E^h_{app})^T(I+h^2E^h_{app})}-I}{h^2}\overset{2,\gamma}{\rightharpoonup}\operatorname{sym}E_{app}\ \text{ in } L^2(\Omega\times\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{M}^d)$$

Proposition 3.6. *Assume that **(H)** is satisfied and let y^h, V^h, V^h_s, V, A, R^h be as above. Let $\varphi\in L^2(S;\dot{H}^2(\mathcal{Y}))$ be such that*

$$\nabla^2(V_s^h\cdot n)\xrightarrow{2,\gamma}\nabla^2(An)+\sum_{i,j=1}^2(\partial^2_{y_iy_j}\varphi)\tau^i\otimes\tau^j,$$

and such that

$$\tfrac{1}{h}q_{V_s^h}\xrightarrow{2,\gamma}: B.$$

Denoting by E^h the strain

$$E^h:=\frac{\sqrt{(\nabla_hy^h)^T\nabla_hy^h}-I}{h^2},\tag{38}$$

there exists

$$U_\gamma\in L^2(S;L_\gamma(I\times\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{M}^3_{\mathrm{sym}}))$$

such that (after passing to a subsequence)

$$E^h\xrightarrow{2,\gamma}E,$$

where E is given by

$$E = B-\tfrac{1}{2}(A^2)_{tan}-t\sum_{i,j=1}^2(\partial^2_{y_iy_j}\varphi)\tau^i\otimes\tau^j-tb_V+U_\gamma.\tag{39}$$

Here, b_V denotes the linearized second fundamental form of the infinitesimal bending V.

Proof. By Lemma 2.10, there exists a subsequence such that $E^h \xrightarrow{2,\gamma} E$ for some E. Denote by E^h_{app} the approximate strain

$$E^h_{\text{app}} := \frac{(R^h)^T \nabla_h y^h - I}{h^2} \tag{40}$$

By Lemma 3.5 it is enough to identify the two-scale limit of $\operatorname{sym} E^h_{\text{app}}$. Let us write

$$R^h E^h_{\text{app}} = \frac{\nabla_h y^h - I}{h^2} - \frac{R^h - I}{h^2}. \tag{41}$$

We have $\operatorname{sym}(R^h E^h_{\text{app}}) \xrightarrow{2,\gamma} E$, because $R^h \to I$ boundedly in measure. By property (vi) of Lemma 2.5 the symmetric part of the second term converges strongly in L^2 (and thus two-scale) to $\frac{A^2}{2}$. So we need to identify the two scale limit of $\operatorname{sym} \frac{\nabla_h y^h - I}{h^2}$. We introduce the comparison maps

$$z^h(x + tn) = x + thn(x) + hV^h_s(x) - th^2(\nabla V^h_s(x))^T n(x).$$

Step 1. In this step we want to prove that the sequence $\left(\frac{y^h - z^h}{h^2}\right)$ satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 3.3. First we will bound the term $\left\|\frac{y^h - z^h}{h^2}\right\|_{L^2}$. By Poincaré's inequality on the interval I, the properties (ii), (iii) of Corollary 2.8 and (vi) of Lemma 2.5 as well as Lemma 2.6, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{S^1} \left|\frac{y^h - z^h}{h^2}\right|^2 \mathrm{d}x &= \int_{S^1} \left|\frac{y^h - \hat{x} - thn(\hat{x}) - hV^h_s(\hat{x})}{h^2}\right|^2 \mathrm{d}x + O(1) \\
&= \iint_{S \times I} \left|\frac{\hat{y}^h - \hat{x} - th\hat{n}(\hat{x}) - h\hat{V}^h_s(\hat{x})}{h^2}\right|^2 \det(I + t\Pi(\hat{x})) dt d\hat{x} \\
&\quad +O(1) \\
&\lesssim \int_{S \times I} \frac{|\partial_t \hat{y}^h - hn(\hat{x})|^2}{h^2} \mathrm{d}t\, \mathrm{d}\hat{x} + O(1),
\end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

where $\limsup_{h\to 0} \|O(1)\|_{L^2} < \infty$. We have $\partial_t \hat{y}^h = \partial_n y^h = h\nabla_h y^h n$. From the property (i) in Lemma 2.7 we conclude that

$$\limsup_{h\to 0} \tfrac{1}{h^3} \|h\nabla_h y^h n - hn - h(R^h \circ \pi - I)n\|_{L^2} < \infty. \tag{43}$$

Using the property (iii) in Lemma 2.5 we conclude that

$$\limsup_{h\to 0} \tfrac{1}{h^2} \|h\nabla_h y^h n - hn\|_{L^2} < \infty. \tag{44}$$

Since we have $\partial_t \hat{y}^h = \partial_n y^h = h\nabla_h y^h n$ we can conclude that indeed

$$\limsup_{h\to 0} \left\|\frac{y^h - z^h}{h^2}\right\|_{L^2} < \infty.$$

Now we need to prove that $\limsup_{h\to 0} \left\|\nabla_h \frac{y^h - z^h}{h^2}\right\|_{L^2} < \infty$. From (14) we deduce that:

$$(\nabla_h z^h)n = 1/h\partial_n z(\hat{x} + tn) = 1/h\partial_t \hat{z}(\hat{x}, t) = n(\hat{x}) - h(\nabla V^h_s(\hat{x}))^T n(\hat{x}) \tag{45}$$

Since we have from the property (i) in Lemma 2.7 that

$$\limsup_{h\to 0} \frac{1}{h^2} \|(\nabla_h y^h - I)n - (R^h \circ \pi - I)n\|_{L^2} < \infty, \tag{46}$$

and by property (i) in Corollary 2.8 that

$$\limsup_{h\to 0} \frac{1}{h^2} \left\|-h(\nabla V^h_s)^T + \left((R^h - I)\big|_{T_{\hat{x}}S}\right)^T\right\|_{L^2} < \infty, \tag{47}$$

we can conclude, using (vi) in Lemma 2.5, that $\nabla_h \frac{y^h - z^h}{h^2} n$ is bounded in $L^2(S^1)$. We have to check the tangential part. From Lemma 2.6 we obtain

$$\limsup_{h\to 0} \frac{1}{h^2} \|\partial_\tau \hat{y}^h - (R^h \circ \pi)(I + th\Pi)\tau\|_{L^2(S\times I)} < \infty, \tag{48}$$

for the arbitrary bounded tangential vector field on S^1. By using the property (iii) in Lemma 2.5 we conclude

$$\limsup_{h\to 0} \frac{1}{h^2} \|\partial_\tau \hat{y}^h - \tau - th\Pi\tau - (R^h \circ \pi - I)\tau\|_{L^2(S\times I)} < \infty. \tag{49}$$

From the definition of z^h and property (v) in Lemma 2.5 we conclude that

$$\partial_\tau \hat{z}^h = \tau + th\Pi(\hat{x})\tau + h\partial_\tau \hat{V}_s^h + O(h^2), \tag{50}$$

where $\limsup_{h\to 0} \frac{1}{h^2}\|O(h^2)\|_{L^2(S\times I)} < \infty$, for any bounded tangential vector field τ on S. By the definition of V^h we conclude that $\partial_\tau \hat{V}^h = \frac{1}{h}\int_I (\partial_\tau y^h - \tau)dt$. By integrating the equation (49) over the interval I we conclude

$$\limsup_{h\to 0} \frac{1}{h^2} \|h\partial_\tau \hat{V}^h - (R^h \circ \pi - I)\tau\|_{L^2(S\times I)} < \infty. \tag{51}$$

From the equations (49), (51) and (iii) in Corollary 2.8 we conclude

$$\limsup_{h\to 0} \frac{1}{h^2} \|\partial_\tau \hat{y}^h - \tau - th\Pi\tau - h\partial_\tau \hat{V}_s^h\|_{L^2(S\times I)} < \infty \tag{52}$$

From Lemma 2.6 and equations (50) and (52) we conclude:

$$\limsup_{h\to 0} \frac{1}{h^2} \|\nabla_h (y^h - z^h)\tau\|_{L^2(S^1)} \leq \limsup_{h\to 0} \frac{1}{h^2} \|\nabla(\hat{y}^h - \hat{z}^h)\|_{L^2(S\times I)} < \infty \tag{53}$$

Using Lemma 3.3 and the fact that $\int_I (\hat{y}^h - \hat{z}^h)dt = 0$ we conclude that there exists $H_\gamma \in L^2(S \times I \times \mathcal{Y}; \mathbb{M}^3))$ of the form given in Lemma 3.3 such that

$$\nabla_h \frac{y^h - z^h}{h^2} \xrightarrow{2,\gamma} H_\gamma, \tag{54}$$

on a subsequence.

Step 2. Next we identify the two scale limit of the quantity $\operatorname{sym}\nabla_h \frac{z^h - I}{h^2}$. Clearly,

$$\nabla_h \frac{z^h - I}{h^2} = \frac{\nabla_h (V_s^h \circ \pi) - \nabla_h \left(\left(th(\nabla V_s^h)^T n\right) \circ \pi\right)}{h}. \tag{55}$$

By Lemma 2.6 we have

$$\nabla_h (V_s^h \circ \pi) = \nabla \hat{V}_s^h (I + th\Pi)^{-1}, \tag{56}$$

and using (iv) of Lemma 2.7 and the fact that

$$\left\|(I + th\Pi)^{-1} - (I - th\Pi)\right\|_{L^\infty} \leq Ch^2, \tag{57}$$

we conclude that

$$\frac{1}{h} \operatorname{sym} \nabla_h (V_s^h \circ \pi) \xrightarrow{2,\gamma} B - t \operatorname{sym}(A\Pi)_{\tan}. \tag{58}$$

We easily obtain

$$\left[\nabla_h \left(\left(t(\nabla V_s^h)^T n\right) \circ \pi\right)\right]_{\tan} \xrightarrow{2,\gamma} -t\big(\nabla(An)\big)_{\tan} + t \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} (\partial^2_{y_i y_j}\varphi)\tau^i \otimes \tau^j. \tag{59}$$

Combining (58) and (59) we conclude that

$$\left(\nabla_h \frac{z^h - I}{h^2}\right)_{\text{tan}} \overset{2,\gamma}{\rightharpoonup} B + t\left(\nabla(An) - \operatorname{sym}\left(A\Pi\right)\right)_{\text{tan}} - t\sum_{i,j=1}^{2}(\partial^2_{y_i y_j}\varphi)\tau^i \otimes \tau^j. \tag{60}$$

Observe that

$$\nabla_h \frac{z^h - I}{h^2} n \cdot n = \frac{[(\nabla V_s^h)^T n] \circ \pi \cdot n}{h} = 0. \tag{61}$$

It remains to verify that

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{sym} \nabla_h \frac{z^h - I}{h^2} \tau \cdot n \quad = \quad & \frac{\nabla_h (V_s^h \circ \pi)\tau \cdot n - \nabla_h \big(th[(\nabla V_s^h)^T n] \circ \pi\big) n \cdot \tau}{2h} \\ & - \frac{\nabla_h \big(th[(\nabla V_s^h)^T n] \circ \pi\big)\tau \cdot n}{2h} \end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

In the same way as in (59) we can conclude that

$$\frac{\nabla_h \big(th[(\nabla V_s^h)^T n] \circ \pi\big)\tau}{2h} \cdot n \to t/2\nabla(An)\tau \cdot n, \text{ strongly in } L^2. \tag{63}$$

We also can observe that

$$\frac{(\nabla \hat{V}_s^h)\tau \cdot n}{2h} - \frac{\nabla_h \big([th(\nabla V_s^h)^T n] \circ \pi\big) n \cdot \tau}{2h} = 0. \tag{64}$$

Also, using (56) and (57) we can see

$$\frac{\big((\nabla \hat{V}_s^h)\tau - \nabla_h (V_s^h \circ \pi)\tau \cdot n\big)}{2h} \to t/2\nabla(A\Pi)\tau \cdot n, \text{ strongly in } L^2. \tag{65}$$

Using the fact that

$$\nabla(An)\tau \cdot n - A\Pi\tau \cdot n = 0, \tag{66}$$

for any arbitrary antisymmetric vector field A, we deduce from (62)-(65) that

$$\operatorname{sym} \nabla_h \frac{z^h - I}{h^2} \tau \cdot n \to 0 \text{ strongly in } L^2. \tag{67}$$

From (60), (61) and (67) we conclude that

$$\operatorname{sym} \nabla_h \frac{z^h - I}{h^2} \overset{2,\gamma}{\rightharpoonup} B + t\big(\operatorname{sym} \nabla(An)\big)_{\text{tan}} - t \operatorname{sym}\left(A\Pi\right)_{\text{tan}} - t\sum_{i,j=1}^{2}(\partial^2_{y_i y_j}\varphi)\tau^i \otimes \tau^j. \tag{68}$$

Step 3. We conclude from (54) and (68) and from (23) that

$$E \quad = \quad B - \tfrac{1}{2}(A^2) - t\sum_{i,j=1}^{2}(\partial^2_{y_i y_j}\varphi)\tau^i \otimes \tau^j - tb_V + \tilde{U}_\gamma \tag{69}$$

for some $\tilde{U}_\gamma \in L^2(S; L_\gamma(I \times \mathcal{Y}, \mathbb{M}^3_{\text{sym}}))$. By defining

$$U_\gamma := \tilde{U}_\gamma - \tfrac{1}{2}(A^2 n \cdot n) n \otimes n - \tfrac{1}{2}(A^2 n \cdot \tau_1)(n \otimes \tau_1 + \tau_1 \otimes n) - \tfrac{1}{2}(A^2 n \cdot \tau_2)(n \otimes \tau_2 + \tau_2 \otimes n),$$

and noticing that $U_\gamma \in L^2(S; L_\gamma(I \times \mathcal{Y}; \mathbb{M}^3_{\text{sym}}))$, for all $\gamma \in [0, \infty]$ we obtain (39).

□

Corollary 3.7. *Under the hypotheses and using the notation of Proposition 3.6, and setting* $B_w = \int_Y B(x,y)\,\mathrm{d}y$, *the following are true:*

(i) If $\gamma \in (0,\infty]$ then there exists $U_\gamma \in L^2(S; L_\gamma(I \times \mathcal{Y}, \mathbb{M}^3_{\text{sym}}))$ such that

$$E = B_w - \tfrac{1}{2}(A^2)_{\mathit{tan}} - tb_V + U_\gamma. \tag{70}$$

(ii) If $\varepsilon^2 \ll h \ll \varepsilon$, there exists $U \in L^2(S; L^0_0(I \times \mathcal{Y}, \mathbb{M}^3_{\text{sym}}))$ and $\varphi \in L^2(S; \dot{H}^2(\mathcal{Y}))$ such that

$$E = B_w - \tfrac{1}{2}(A^2)_{\mathit{tan}} - tb_V + U. \tag{71}$$

(iii) If $h \sim \varepsilon^2$, with $\lim_{h\to 0} \frac{\varepsilon^2}{h} = \frac{1}{\gamma_1} \in (0,\infty)$, there exists $U \in L^2(S; L^1_0(I \times \mathcal{Y}, \mathbb{M}^3_{\text{sym}}))$ such that

$$E = B_w - \tfrac{1}{2}(A^2)_{\mathit{tan}} - tb_V + U. \tag{72}$$

Proof. All claims follow from Proposition 3.2 and from Proposition 3.6. For the case (i) one uses that, for $\gamma \in (0,\infty)$,

$$\operatorname{sym}(\hat{\nabla}_y, \tfrac{1}{\gamma}\partial_3) \begin{pmatrix} t\partial_{y_1}\varphi \\ t\partial_{y_2}\varphi \\ \frac{1}{\gamma}\varphi \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} t(\partial_{y_i y_j}\varphi)^2_{i,j=1} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{73}$$

□

Lemma 3.8. *Let $(y^h) \subset H^1(S^1; \mathbb{R}^3)$, define E^h by*

$$\sqrt{(\nabla_h y^h)^T (\nabla_h y^h)} = I + h^2 E^h(x),$$

and assume that $E^h \xrightarrow{2,\gamma} E$. Then we have:

(i)

$$\liminf_{h\to 0} \int_{S\times I} \mathcal{Q}(x, \tfrac{r(\pi(x))}{\varepsilon(h)}, E^h(x))\,\mathrm{d}x \geq \int_S \int_{I\times\mathcal{Y}} \mathcal{Q}(x, y, E(\hat{x}, t, y))\,\mathrm{d}t\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x.$$

(ii)

$$\liminf_{h\to 0} \frac{1}{h^4} \int_{S\times I} W(x, \tfrac{r(\pi(x))}{\varepsilon(h)}, I + h^2 E^h(x)) dx \geq \int_S \int_{I\times\mathcal{Y}} \mathcal{Q}(x, y, E(x, y))\,\mathrm{d}t\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x.$$

Proof. For the first claim we refer to [Vis06, Vis07]. The second claim follows from a standard truncation argument in combination with (i). □

The lower bound part of Theorem 4.5 and Theorem 5.3 is now a direct consequence of Proposition 3.6, Corollary 3.7 and of Lemma 3.8.

4 Upper bound

For $\gamma \in (0,\infty]$ we define the mappings $\mathcal{Q}_\gamma : S \times \mathbb{M}(T_{\hat{x}}S) \times M(T_{\hat{x}}S) \to \mathbb{R}$:

$$\mathcal{Q}_\gamma(\hat{x}, M^1_{\tan}, M^2_{\tan}) = \inf_{U \in L_\gamma(I\times\mathcal{Y}; \mathbb{M}^3_{\text{sym}})} \iint_{I\times\mathcal{Y}} \mathcal{Q}\Big(\hat{x}, t, y, M^1_{\tan} + tM^2_{\tan} + U\Big)\,\mathrm{d}t\,\mathrm{d}y, \tag{74}$$

Also we define for $\gamma_1 \in (0,\infty)$:

$$\mathcal{Q}_0^0(\hat{x}, M^1_{\text{tan}}, M^2_{\text{tan}}) = \inf_{U\in L^0_0(I\times\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{M}^3_{\text{sym}})} \iint_{I\times\mathcal{Y}} \mathcal{Q}\Big(\hat{x}, t, y, M^1_{\text{tan}} + tM^2_{\text{tan}} + U\Big)\,\mathrm{d}t\,\mathrm{d}y, \tag{75}$$

$$\mathcal{Q}_0^{1,\gamma_1}(\hat{x}, M^1_{\text{tan}}, M^2_{\text{tan}}) = \inf_{U\in L^{1,\gamma_1}_0(I\times\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{M}^3_{\text{sym}})} \iint_{I\times\mathcal{Y}} \mathcal{Q}\Big(\hat{x}, t, y, M^1_{\text{tan}} + tM^2_{\text{tan}} + U\Big)\,\mathrm{d}t\,\mathrm{d}y. \tag{76}$$

The following two lemmas and remark are analogous to [NV][Lemma 2.10, 2.11].

Lemma 4.1. *For $\gamma \in (0,\infty]$ there exists a bounded linear operator*

$$\Pi_\gamma : L^2(S, \mathbb{M}^2(TS)) \times L^2(S, \mathbb{M}^2(TS)) \to L^2(S, L_\gamma(I\times\mathcal{Y}, \mathbb{M}^3_{\text{sym}}))$$

such that

a. *for all $M^1_{tan}, M^2_{tan} \in C(S, \mathbb{M}(TS))$, the field $(\hat{x}, t, y) \mapsto \Pi_\gamma[M^1_{tan}, M^2_{tan}](\hat{x}, t, y)$ is equivalent (up to a null-set) to a field in $C(S, L_\gamma(I\times\mathcal{Y}, \mathbb{M}^3_{\text{sym}}))$,*

b. *for almost every $\hat{x} \in S$ we have*

$$\mathcal{Q}_\gamma(\hat{x}, M^1_{tan}, M^2_{tan}) = \iint_{I\times Y} \mathcal{Q}\left(\hat{x}, t, y,\ M^1_{tan} + tM^2_{tan} + \Pi_\gamma[M^1_{tan}, M^2_{tan}]\right)\,\mathrm{d}t\,\mathrm{d}y.$$

Using the previous lemma one can readily derive the following properties for $\mathcal{Q}_\gamma$:

Lemma 4.2. *The mapping $\mathcal{Q}_\gamma : S \times \mathbb{M}^2(T_{\hat{x}}S) \times \mathbb{M}^2(T_{\hat{x}}S) \to \mathbb{R}^+$ satisfies*

($\mathcal{Q}_\gamma$1) $\mathcal{Q}_\gamma$ is continuous

($\mathcal{Q}_\gamma$2) $\mathcal{Q}_\gamma(\hat{x}, \cdot, \cdot)$ is quadratic and

$$\begin{aligned}(|\operatorname{sym} M^1_{tan}|^2 + |\operatorname{sym} M^1_{tan}|^2) &\lesssim \mathcal{Q}_\gamma(\hat{x}, M^1_{tan}, M^2_{tan}) = \mathcal{Q}_\gamma(\hat{x}, \operatorname{sym} M^1_{tan}, \operatorname{sym} M^1_{tan}) \\ &\lesssim |\operatorname{sym} M^1_{tan}|^2 + |\operatorname{sym} M^2_{tan}|^2\end{aligned}$$

for all $M^1_{tan}, M^2_{tan} \in \mathbb{M}^2(T_{\hat{x}}S)$ and $\hat{x} \in S$.

Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.2 remain true for the quadratic forms $\mathcal{Q}^0_0$, $\mathcal{Q}^{1,\gamma_1}_0$, the spaces $L^0_0(I\times\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{M}^3_{\text{sym}})$, $L^{1,\gamma_1}_0(I\times\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{M}^3_{\text{sym}})$, and the appropriate operators

$$\Pi^0_0 : L^2(S, \mathbb{M}^2(TS)) \times L^2(S, \mathbb{M}^2(TS)) \to L^2(S, L^0_0(I\times\mathcal{Y}, \mathbb{M}^3_{\text{sym}}))$$

and

$$\Pi^{1,\gamma_1}_0 : L^2(S, \mathbb{M}^2(TS)) \times L^2(S, \mathbb{M}^2(TS)) \to L^2(S, L^{1,\gamma_1}_0(I\times\mathcal{Y}, \mathbb{M}^3_{\text{sym}}))$$

for $\gamma_1 \in (0,\infty)$.

Remark 5. We discuss the cell formula in the limiting cases $\gamma = 0$ and $\gamma = \infty$.

(i) In the case $\gamma = \infty$ define

$$\widetilde{L}_\infty(I\times\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{M}^3_{\text{sym}}) := \left\{ \sum_{i,j=1}^3 M_{ij}\tau^i\otimes\tau^j \ : M = \begin{pmatrix} \operatorname{sym}\hat{\nabla}_y\zeta & \begin{matrix}\partial_{y_1}\psi + c_1 \\ \partial_{y_2}\psi + c_2\end{matrix} \\ \hat{\nabla}_y\psi + (c_1, c_2) & c_3 \end{pmatrix}, \right.$$
$$\left. \zeta \in \dot{H}^1(\mathcal{Y}, \mathbb{R}^2), \psi \in \dot{H}^1(\mathcal{Y}),\ c \in \mathbb{R}^3 \right\}.$$

Also define

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{Q}}_\infty(\hat{x}, t, M^1_{\mathrm{tan}}, M^2_{\mathrm{tan}}) = \inf_{U \in \widetilde{L}_\infty(I\times\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{M}^3_{\mathrm{sym}})} \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \mathcal{Q}\Big(\hat{x}, t, y, M^1_{\mathrm{tan}} + tM^2_{\mathrm{tan}} + U\Big)\,\mathrm{d}y. \tag{77}$$

It is easy to see that $\widetilde{\mathcal{Q}}_\infty$ is, for a fixed $\hat{x} \in S$, $t \in I$, a quadratic form in $M^1_{\mathrm{tan}}, M^2_{\mathrm{tan}}$. Then

$$\mathcal{Q}_\infty(\hat{x}, M^1_{\mathrm{tan}}, M^2_{\mathrm{tan}}) = \int_I \widetilde{\mathcal{Q}}_\infty(\hat{x}, t, M^1_{\mathrm{tan}}, M^2_{\mathrm{tan}})\,\mathrm{d}t \tag{78}$$

(ii) Let us define as in [LMP10]

$$\mathcal{Q}_2(\hat{x}, t, M^1_{\mathrm{tan}}, M^2_{\mathrm{tan}}) = \min_{M\in\mathbb{M}^3} \{\mathcal{Q}(\hat{x}, t, M) : (M^1_{\mathrm{tan}} + tM^2_{\mathrm{tan}}) - M)_{\mathrm{tan}} = 0\}. \tag{79}$$

Let us also define

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{L}^0_0(I\times\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{M}^3_{\mathrm{sym}}) \quad &:= \quad \Bigg\{ \sum_{i,j=1}^2 M_{ij}\tau^i \otimes \tau^j \ : M = \big(\ \mathrm{sym}\,\hat{\nabla}_y\zeta - t\hat{\nabla}^2_y\varphi\ \big), \\
&\qquad\qquad \zeta \in \dot{H}^1(\mathcal{Y},\mathbb{R}^2), \varphi \in \dot{H}^2(\mathcal{Y})\Bigg\}, \\
\widetilde{L}^{1,\gamma_1}_0(I\times\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{M}^3_{\mathrm{sym}}) \quad &:= \quad \Bigg\{ \sum_{i,j=1}^2 M_{ij}\tau^i \otimes \tau^j \ : M = \Big(\ \mathrm{sym}\,\hat{\nabla}_y\zeta + \tfrac{1}{\gamma_1}\varphi\Pi_{ij}(\hat{x}) - t\hat{\nabla}^2_y\varphi\ \Big), \\
&\qquad\qquad \zeta \in \dot{H}^1(\mathcal{Y},\mathbb{R}^2), \varphi \in \dot{H}^2(\mathcal{Y})\Bigg\}
\end{aligned}$$

It can be easily seen that we have for the cell formula

$$\mathcal{Q}^0_0(\hat{x}, M^1_{\mathrm{tan}}, M^2_{\mathrm{tan}}) = \inf_{U\in\widetilde{L}^0_0(I\times\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{M}^3_{\mathrm{sym}})} \iint_{I\times\mathcal{Y}} \mathcal{Q}_2\Big(\hat{x}, t, y, M^1_{\mathrm{tan}} + tM^2_{\mathrm{tan}} + U\Big)\,\mathrm{d}t\,\mathrm{d}y, \tag{80}$$

for i=0,2 i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{Q}^{1,\gamma_1}_0(\hat{x}, M^1_{\mathrm{tan}}, M^2_{\mathrm{tan}}) \quad &= \\
&\inf_{U\in\widetilde{L}^{1,\gamma_1}_0(I\times\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{M}^3_{\mathrm{sym}})} \iint_{I\times\mathcal{Y}} \mathcal{Q}_2\Big(\hat{x}, t, y, M^1_{\mathrm{tan}} + tM^2_{\mathrm{tan}} + U\Big)\,\mathrm{d}t\,\mathrm{d}y.
\end{aligned} \tag{81}$$

In the case when $\mathcal{Q}$ does not depend on t we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{Q}^0_0(\hat{x}, M^1_{\mathrm{tan}}, M^2_{\mathrm{tan}}) \quad &= \quad \inf_{\zeta\in\dot{H}^1(\mathcal{Y},\mathbb{R}^2)} \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \mathcal{Q}_2(\hat{x}, y, M^1_{\mathrm{tan}} + \sum_{i,j=1}^2 (\mathrm{sym}\,\hat{\nabla}_y\zeta)_{ij}\tau^i\otimes\tau^j)\,\mathrm{d}y \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{12} \inf_{\varphi\in\dot{H}^2(\mathcal{Y})} \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \mathcal{Q}_2(\hat{x}, y, M^2_{\mathrm{tan}} + \sum_{i,j=1}^2 (\hat{\nabla}^2_y\varphi)_{ij}\tau_i\otimes\tau_j)\,\mathrm{d}y, \\
\mathcal{Q}^{1,\gamma_1}_0(\hat{x}, M^1_{\mathrm{tan}}, M^2_{\mathrm{tan}}) \quad &= \\
\inf_{\zeta\in\dot{H}^1(\mathcal{Y},\mathbb{R}^2),\varphi\in\dot{H}^2(\mathcal{Y})} \quad & \Bigg(\int_{\mathcal{Y}} \mathcal{Q}_2\Big(\hat{x}, y, M^1_{\mathrm{tan}} + \sum_{i,j=1}^2 \big((\mathrm{sym}\,\hat{\nabla}_y\zeta)_{ij} + \tfrac{1}{\gamma_1}\varphi\Pi_{ij}\big)\tau^i\otimes\tau^j\Big)\big)\,\mathrm{d}y \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{12} \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \mathcal{Q}_2(\hat{x}, y, M^2_{\mathrm{tan}} + \sum_{i,j=1}^2 (\hat{\nabla}^2_y\varphi)_{ij}\tau_i\otimes\tau_j)\,\mathrm{d}y\Bigg).
\end{aligned}$$

Remark 6. In the same way as in [NV] we can prove the following: For every $M^1_{\text{tan}}, M^2_{\text{tan}} \in \mathbb{M}^2(T_{\hat{x}}S)$ and $\hat{x} \in S$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{\gamma\to\infty} \mathcal{Q}_\gamma(\hat{x}, M^1_{\text{tan}}, M^2_{\text{tan}}) &= \mathcal{Q}_\infty(\hat{x}, M^1_{\text{tan}}, M^2_{\text{tan}}) \\
\lim_{\gamma\to 0} \mathcal{Q}_\gamma(\hat{x}, M^1_{\text{tan}}, M^2_{\text{tan}}) &= \mathcal{Q}^0_0(\hat{x}, M^1_{\text{tan}}, M^2_{\text{tan}})
\end{aligned}$$

We need the following auxiliary result concerning the linearization of the square root of a matrix. Its proof is straighforward by Taylor expansions.

Lemma 4.3. *There exists $\eta > 0$ and a monotone function $m : (0, \eta) \to \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $m(\delta) \to 0$ as $\delta \to 0$ and which satisfy the following property:*

Let $\{G^h\}_{h>0}, \{K^h\}_{h>0} \subset L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{M}^3)$ be such that

(i)

$$\limsup_{h\to 0} \left(\|\operatorname{sym} G^h\|_{L^2} + \|K^h\|_{L^4}\right) < M.$$

(ii)

$$\limsup_{h\to 0} \left\| \frac{\operatorname{sym} K^h}{h} \right\|_{L^2} = 0$$

(iii) $\limsup_{h\to 0} h\|K^h\|_{L^\infty} \le \delta$, $\limsup_{h\to 0} h^2\|G^h\|_{L^\infty} \le \delta$*, for some* $\delta < \eta$

(iv) $\limsup_{h\to 0} h\|G^h\|_{L^4} = 0.$

Let us denote by

$$E^h := \frac{\sqrt{(I + hK^h + h^2G^h)^t(I + hK^h + h^2G^h)} - I}{h^2},$$

and by

$$E^h_{app} = \operatorname{sym} G^h - \frac{1}{2}(K^h)^2. \tag{82}$$

Then we have

(i)

$$\limsup_{h\to 0} \|E^h - E^h_{app}\|_{L^2} \le Mm(\delta),$$

(ii)

$$\begin{aligned}
\limsup_{h\to 0} \Big| \frac{1}{h^4} \int_{S\times I} & W(x, \tfrac{r(\pi(x))}{\varepsilon(h)}, I + h^2E^h(x))dx \\
& - \int_{S\times I} \mathcal{Q}(x, \tfrac{r(\pi(x))}{\varepsilon(h)}, E^h_{app}(x))\, dx \Big| \le Mm(\delta).
\end{aligned}$$

(iii) if $E^h_{app} \xrightarrow{2,\gamma} E(x,y)$, strongly two scale, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\limsup_{h\to 0} \Big| \frac{1}{h^4} \int_{S\times I} & W(x, \tfrac{r(\pi(x))}{\varepsilon(h)}, I + h^2E^h(x))dx \\
& - \int_S \int_{I\times\mathcal{Y}} \mathcal{Q}(x, y, E(x,y))\, \mathrm{d}t\, \mathrm{d}y\, dx \Big| \le Mm(\delta).
\end{aligned}$$

Suppose $V \in H^2(S;\mathbb{R}^{3\times 3})$ is an infinitesimal bending of S; hence there is $A \in H^1(S;\mathrm{so}(3))$ such that

$$\partial_\tau V(x) = A(\hat{x})\tau, \text{ for all } \tau \in T_{\hat{x}}S. \tag{83}$$

Let $B_w \in \mathcal{B}$ and define for $\gamma \in (0,\infty]$ the functionals $I_\gamma : H^2(S;\mathbb{R}^3) \times L^2(S;\mathbb{M}^2(TS)) \to \mathbb{R}$ by setting

$$I_\gamma(V, B_w) = \int_S \mathcal{Q}_\gamma(\hat{x}, B_w - \tfrac{1}{2}(A^2)_{\tan}, -b_V)\,\mathrm{d}\hat{x}, \tag{84}$$

and for $\gamma = 0$, the functionals $I_0^0 : H^2(S;\mathbb{R}^3) \times L^2(S;\mathbb{M}^2(T_{\hat{x}}S)) \to \mathbb{R}$

$$I_0^0(V, B_w) = \int_S \mathcal{Q}_0^0(\hat{x}, B_w - \tfrac{1}{2}(A^2)_{\tan}, -b_V)\,\mathrm{d}\hat{x}, \tag{85}$$

as well as for $\gamma_1 \in (0,\infty)$ the functionals $I_0^{1,\gamma_1} : H^2(S;\mathbb{R}^3) \times L^2(S;\mathbb{M}^2(TS)) \to \mathbb{R}$:

$$I_0^{1,\gamma_1}(V, B_w) = \int_S \mathcal{Q}_0^{1,\gamma_1}(\hat{x}, B_w - \tfrac{1}{2}(A^2)_{\tan}, -b_V)\,\mathrm{d}\hat{x}. \tag{86}$$

Note that A in the last three formulae is just the quadratic form $(dV)^2$.

Proposition 4.4. *For every $B_w \in \mathcal{B}$ and for every infinitesimal bending $V \in H^2(S;\mathbb{R}^{3\times 3})$ of S, there exists a recovery sequence $(u^h) \subset H^1(S^h,\mathbb{R}^3)$ such that the sequence $(y^h) \subset H^1(S^h,\mathbb{R}^3)$ defined by (11) satisfies the following:*

(i) $y^h \to \pi$ strongly in $H^1(S^1;\mathbb{R}^3)$.

(ii) $V^h \to V$ strongly in $H^1(S;\mathbb{R}^3)$, where V^h is as in (22).

(iii) $\frac{1}{h}q_{V^h} \rightharpoonup B_w$ weakly in $L^2(S;M^2_{\mathrm{sym}}(TS))$.

(iv) (a) $\lim_{h\to 0}\frac{1}{h^4}I^h(y^h) = I_\gamma(V,B_w)$ if $\gamma \in (0,\infty]$;
(b) $\lim_{h\to 0}\frac{1}{h^4}I^h(y^h) = I_0^0(V,B_w)$ if $\varepsilon \gg h \gg \varepsilon^2$;
(c) $\lim_{h\to 0}\frac{1}{h^4}I^h(y^h) = I_0^{1,\gamma_1}(V,B_w)$, if $h \sim \varepsilon^2$ and $\lim_{h\to 0}\frac{\varepsilon(h)^2}{h} =: \frac{1}{\gamma_1}$.

Proof. The proof is a modification of the proof of the recovery sequence in [LMP10], cf. also [FJM06].

Construction for $\gamma \in (0,\infty]$:

Step 1. Approximation of B_w

By definition, for $B_w \in \mathcal{B}$ there exists a sequence of vector fields $w^{\delta,h} \in L^2(S;\mathbb{R}^3)$ such that $q_{w^{\delta,h}}$ converge weakly in $L^2(S)$ to B_w. Without loss of generality we may assume that $w^{\delta,h}$ are smooth, $\int_S w^{\delta,h} = 0$ and (by possibly reparametrizing the sequence) that there exists a constant $M_1 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\limsup_{h\to 0} h\|\nabla w^{\delta,h}\|_{L^4} = 0,\ \limsup_{h\to 0} h\|\nabla^2 w^{\delta,h}\|_{L^2} < M_1;\\
&\limsup_{h\to 0} h^2\|\nabla w^{\delta,h}\|_{L^\infty} = 0,\ \limsup_{h\to 0} h^3\|\nabla^2 w^{\delta,h}\|_{L^\infty} = 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{87}$$

These conditions are satisfied provided (see the case $\gamma = 0$)

$$\limsup_{h\to 0} h\|w^{\delta,h}\|_{W^{2,\infty}} = 0,\ q_{w^{\delta,h}} \to B_w \text{ strongly in } L^2. \tag{88}$$

This can be accomplished by taking a strongly convergent sequence and reparametrizing it.

Step 2. Approximation of V.

Let $V \in H^2(S,\mathbb{R}^3)$ be an infinitesimal bending of S, so there is a skew symmetric matrix field $A \in H^1(S;\mathbb{M}^3)$ such that $\partial_\tau V = A(\hat{x})\tau$, for all $\tau \in T_{\hat{x}}S$.
We approximate V by a sequence $v^{\delta,h} \in W^{2,\infty}(S;\mathbb{R}^3)$ such that, for each $\delta > 0$ we have:

$$\begin{gathered}
\limsup_{h\to 0} \|v^{\delta,h} - V\|_{H^2(S)} = 0, \quad \limsup_{h\to 0} h\|v^{\delta,h}\|_{W^{2,\infty}(S)} \leq \delta \\
\lim_{h\to 0} \frac{1}{h^2} \big|\{x \in S; v^{\delta,h}(x) \neq V(x)\}\big| = 0.
\end{gathered} \tag{89}$$

The existence of such $v^{\delta,h}$ follows by Proposition A.5 in the appendix. Now we want to prove that such $v^{\delta,h}$ satisfies

$$\lim_{h\to 0} \frac{1}{h} \|q_{v^{\delta,h}}\|_{L^2(S)} = 0. \tag{90}$$

Namely, since the Lipschitz constant of each $\nabla v^{\delta,h}$ is bounded by $\frac{\delta}{h}$ and $\operatorname{sym}\nabla v^{\delta,h} = 0$ on the set $\{x \in S; v^{\delta,h}(x) = V(x)\}$, we have:

$$|q_{v^{\delta,h}}(x)| \leq C\tfrac{1}{h} \operatorname{dist}\big(x, \{v^{\delta,h} = V\}\big).$$

Now we claim that $\frac{1}{h}\operatorname{dist}\big(x,\{v^{\delta,h} = V\}\big)$ converges to 0, in $L^\infty(S)$. For otherwise there would be $\operatorname{dist}(x^h,\{v^{\delta,h} = V\}) \geq C_1 h$, for some sequence $x^h \in S$ and some $C_1 > 0$. Consequently, denoting by $B_{x^h}(r)$ the ball in $\mathbb{R}^3$ centered at x^h and radius r, we would obtain:

$$\big|\{x \in S; v^{\delta,h}(x) \neq V(x)\}\big| \geq \Big|S \cap B_{x^h}\big(\tfrac{1}{2}\operatorname{dist}(x^h,\{v^{\delta,h} \neq V\})\big)\Big| \geq C_2 h^2,$$

contradicting (89). In the last inequality above we used regularity of the surface S. We thus obtain:

$$q_{v^{\delta,h}} \to 0, \tag{91}$$

uniformly on S as $h \to 0$. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{h}\|q_{v^{\delta,h}}\|_{L^2(S)} &\leq \frac{1}{h}\big|\{x \in S; v^{\delta,h}(x) \neq V(x)\}\big|^{1/2} \cdot \|q_{v^{\delta,h}}\|_{L^\infty(S)} \\
&\leq C\|q_{v^{\delta,h}}\|_{L^\infty(S)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{92}$$

From this we deduce (90).

Step 3. Defining the sequence $y^{\delta,h}$.

Let us take $p^\delta \in C^1(S; C^1(I \times \mathcal{Y};\mathbb{R}^3)$

and $o^\delta \in C^1(S; C^1(I \times \mathcal{Y};\mathbb{R}^3))$ and let us define a sequence of rescaled deformations $y^{\delta,h} \in H^1(S^1;\mathbb{R}^3)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
y^{\delta,h}(\hat{x} + tn(\hat{x})) &= \hat{x} + hv^{\delta,h}(\hat{x}) + h^2 w^{\delta,h}(\hat{x}) \\
&\quad + thn(\hat{x}) - th^2(\nabla v^{\delta,h}(\hat{x}))^T n(\hat{x}) \\
&\quad - th^3(\nabla w^{\delta,h}(\hat{x}))^T n(x) + h^3 p^\delta(\hat{x}, t, \tfrac{r(\hat{x})}{\varepsilon(h)}) \\
&\quad + h^2 \varepsilon(h) o^\delta(\hat{x}, t, \tfrac{r(\hat{x})}{\varepsilon(h)}).
\end{aligned} \tag{93}$$

Notice that:

$$(\nabla v^{\delta,h}(x))^T n(x) = \big(\Pi v^{\delta,h}_{\tan} - \nabla(v^{\delta,h} n)\big)(x). \tag{94}$$

Note also that if $V \in W^{2,\infty}(S)$ then one may take $v^{\delta,h} = V$ in which case the term $th^2(\nabla v^{\delta,h})^T n$ is exactly $-th^2 An$. It is easily seen that $y^{\delta,h}$ for δ fixed and $h \to 0$ converge to π in $H^1(S^1)$.
We also have:

$$V^{\delta,h}[y^{\delta,h}] = v^{\delta,h} + hw^{\delta,h} + h\varepsilon(h)\int_I o^\delta\, dt + h^2 \int_I p^\delta \,\mathrm{d}t, \tag{95}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{h} q_{V^{\delta,h}} &= \frac{1}{h} q_{v^{\delta,h}} + q_{w^{\delta,h}} + \varepsilon(h) q_{\int_I o^\delta \,\mathrm{d}t} \\
&\quad + h q_{\int_I p^\delta \,\mathrm{d}t}
\end{aligned} \tag{96}$$

Hence from (96) and (90) we deduce

$$\frac{1}{h}\operatorname{sym}\nabla V^{\delta,h} \rightharpoonup B_w, \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(S;\mathbb{M}^2(T_{\hat{x}}S)), \tag{97}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{h\to 0}\left\|\frac{1}{h}q_{V^{\delta,h}}\right\|_{L^2} \leq R\Big(&\limsup_{h\to 0}\|q_{w^{\delta,h}}\|_{L^2}+\|o^\delta\|_{L^2(S;H^1(I\times\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{R}^3))}\\ &+\limsup_{h\to 0} h\|q_{\int_I p^\delta\,\mathrm{d}t}\|_{L^2}\Big),\end{aligned} \tag{98}$$

for some $R>0$. Notice that for $w^{\delta,h}$ that satisfies (88) we have

$$\limsup_{h\to 0}\|q_{w^{\delta,h}}\|_{L^2} = \|B_w\|_{L^2}. \tag{99}$$

Now let us look at the quantities $\nabla_h y^{\delta,h}$. Lemma 2.6 implies that

$$\begin{aligned}(\nabla_h y^{\delta,h})(\hat{x}+tn)n &= n - h(\nabla v^{\delta,h})^T n - h^2(\nabla w^{\delta,h})^T n\\ &\quad +h^2\partial_t p^\delta + h\varepsilon(h)\partial_t o^\delta(x,t,\tfrac{r_1(x)}{\varepsilon(h)},\tfrac{r_2(x)}{\varepsilon(h)}),\\ (\nabla_h y^{\delta,h})(\hat{x}+tn)\tau &= \nabla y^{\delta,h}(\hat{x}+tn)(I+t\Pi)(I+th\Pi)^{-1}\tau\\ &= \Bigg(I + h\nabla v^{\delta,h} + h^2\nabla w^{\delta,h} + th\Pi - th^2\nabla((\nabla v^{h,\delta})^T n)\\ &\quad -th^3\nabla((\nabla w^{\delta,h})^T n) + th^3\nabla_{\hat{x}}p^\delta(\hat{x},t,\tfrac{r(\hat{x})}{\varepsilon(h)})\\ &\quad +th^3/\varepsilon(h)\nabla_y p^\delta(\hat{x},t,\tfrac{r(\hat{x})}{\varepsilon(h)})[\tau^1\ \tau^2]^T\\ &\quad +h^2\nabla_y o^\delta(\hat{x},t,\tfrac{r(\hat{x})}{\varepsilon(h)})[\tau^1\ \tau^2]^T\\ &\quad +h^2\varepsilon(h)\nabla_{\hat{x}}o^\delta(\hat{x},t,\tfrac{r(\hat{x})}{\varepsilon(h)})[\tau^1\ \tau^2]^T\Bigg)(I+th\Pi)^{-1}\tau,\end{aligned}$$

for all $\tau\in T_{\hat{x}}S$. Let us now define $K^{h,\delta}, G^{h,\delta}: S^1\to\mathbb{M}^3$ in the following way

$$K^{\delta,h}(\hat{x}+tn)n = -(\nabla v^{\delta,h})^T n, \tag{100}$$

$$K^{\delta,h}(\hat{x}+tn)\tau = \nabla v^{\delta,h}\tau, \tag{101}$$

$$G^{\delta,h}(\hat{x}+tn)n = -(\nabla w^{\delta,h})^T n + \partial_t p^\delta + \frac{\varepsilon(h)}{h}\partial_t o^\delta(x,t,\tfrac{r(x)}{\varepsilon(h)}), \tag{102}$$

$$\begin{aligned}G^{\delta,h}(\hat{x}+tn)\tau &= \frac{1}{h}\nabla v^{\delta,h}\Big[(I+th\Pi)^{-1}-I\Big]\tau\\ &\quad +\Bigg(\nabla w^{\delta,h} - t\nabla((\nabla v^{h,\delta})^T n) - th\nabla((\nabla w^{\delta,h})^T n)\\ &\quad +th\nabla_{\hat{x}}p^\delta(\hat{x},t,\tfrac{r(\hat{x})}{\varepsilon(h)}) + th/\varepsilon(h)\nabla_y p^\delta(\hat{x},t,\tfrac{r(\hat{x})}{\varepsilon(h)})[\tau^1\ \tau^2]^T\\ &\quad +\sum_{i=1,2,3;j=1,2}\partial_{y_j}\bar{o}_i^\delta(\hat{x},t,\tfrac{r(\hat{x})}{\varepsilon(h)})\tau^i\otimes\tau^j\\ &\quad +\varepsilon(h)\nabla_{\hat{x}}o^\delta(\hat{x},t,\tfrac{r(\hat{x})}{\varepsilon(h)})[\tau^1\ \tau^2]^T\Bigg)(I+th\Pi)^{-1}\tau,\end{aligned} \tag{103}$$

where we have put $\bar{o}_i = o\cdot\tau_i$ for $i=1,2,3$. Using the identity

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_y v(x,t,y)[\tau^1\ \tau^2]^T &= \sum_{i,j=1,2}\partial_{y_j}(v(x,t,y)\cdot\tau_i)\tau^i\otimes\tau^j\\ &\quad +\sum_{j=1,2}\partial_{y_j}(v(x,t,y)\cdot n)n\otimes\tau^j,\end{aligned}$$

we can see that

$$\nabla_h y^{\delta,h} = I + hK^{\delta,h} + h^2 G^{\delta,h}. \tag{104}$$

In what follows we shall assume that

$$\limsup_{h\to 0} \left\| th/\varepsilon(h) \nabla_y p^\delta(\hat{x}, t, \tfrac{r(\hat{x})}{\varepsilon(h)})[\tau^1\ \tau^2]^T \right\|_{L^\infty} = 0. \tag{105}$$

Let us denote as in Lemma 4.3

$$E^{\delta,h} := \frac{\sqrt{(I + hK^{\delta,h} + h^2 G^{\delta,h})^t (I + hK^{\delta,h} + h^2 G^{\delta,h})} - I}{h^2},$$

and by

$$E^{\delta,h}_{app} = \operatorname{sym} G^{\delta,h} - \frac{1}{2}(K^{\delta,h})^2. \tag{106}$$

By using Sobolev embedding, the properties (87), (89), (90) we can easily prove (ii)-(iii) of Lemma 4.3. (iv) is a direct consequence of (87) and the facts

$$\begin{aligned}
\limsup_{h\to 0} \left(h \|\nabla^2 v^{\delta,h}\|_{L^4}\right) &\leq \limsup_{h\to 0} \left(h \sqrt{\|\nabla^2 v^{\delta,h}\|_{L^\infty}} \sqrt{\|\nabla^2 v^{\delta,h}\|_{L^2}}\right) = 0, \\
\limsup_{h\to 0} \left(h^2 \|\nabla^2 w^h\|_{L^4}\right) &\leq \limsup_{h\to 0} \left(h^2 \sqrt{\|\nabla^2 w^h\|_{L^\infty}} \sqrt{\|\nabla^2 w^h\|_{L^2}}\right) = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

which follows from (87) and (89). Let us also notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
\limsup_{h\to 0} \left(\|\operatorname{sym} G^{\delta,h}\|_{L^2} + \|K^{\delta,h}\|_{L^4}\right) &\lesssim \|B_w\|_{L^2} + \|V\|_{H^2} + \|\partial_t p^\delta\|_{L^2} \\
&\quad + \|o^\delta\|_{L^2(S;H^1(I\times\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{R}^3))} + \delta + M_1,
\end{aligned} \tag{107}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
E^{\delta,h}_{app} &\xrightarrow{2,\gamma} B_w - \tfrac{1}{2}A^2 - tb_V \\
&\quad + \partial_t \bar{p}^\delta_3 n \otimes n + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1,2} \partial_t \bar{p}^\delta_i \left(\tau^i \otimes n + n \otimes \tau^i\right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{i,j=1,2,3} \operatorname{sym}\left(\nabla_y \bar{o}^\delta(x,t,y), \tfrac{1}{\gamma}\partial_t \bar{o}^\delta(x,t,y)\right)_{ij} \tau^i \otimes \tau^j,
\end{aligned} \tag{108}$$

where we have used identity (66) and where we have put $\bar{p}^\delta_i := p^\delta \cdot \tau_i$.

The case $\gamma \in (0,\infty)$. Let us take the sequence of functions $A^\delta \in C^2(S; \mathrm{so}(3))$ such that $\lim_{\delta\to 0} \|A^\delta - A\|_{H^1} = 0$ and define

$$\bar{p}^\delta_\alpha = t(A^\delta)^2 \tau_i \cdot n, \text{ for } \alpha = 1,2;\ \bar{p}^\delta_3 = \frac{t}{2}(A^\delta)^2 n \cdot n. \tag{109}$$

Notice that for such defined $\bar{p}^\delta$, p^δ trivially satisfies (105). Let us now take $\bar{o}^\delta \in C^1(S; C^1(I \times \mathcal{Y}; \mathbb{R}^3))$ such that

$$\lim_{\delta\to 0} \left\|\mathcal{U}_\gamma(\bar{o}^\delta) - \Pi_\gamma\left(B_w - \tfrac{1}{2}A^2_{\text{tan}}, -b_V\right)\right\|_{L^2(S;\mathbb{M}^3)} = 0, \tag{110}$$

where $\mathcal{U}_\gamma$ is defined in Definition 3.4 and the operator Π_γ in Lemma 4.1. Let us define the function

$$\begin{aligned}
g(\delta,h) &= \|y^{\delta,h} - \pi\|_{H^1} + \|V^{\delta,h} - V\|_{H^1} + \tilde{d}^K\left(\tfrac{1}{h} q_{V^{\delta,h}}, B_w\right) \\
&\quad + \left|\tfrac{1}{h^4} I^h(y^h) - I_\gamma(V, B_w)\right|.
\end{aligned}$$

Here $\tilde{d}^K : L^2(S; M^3) \times L^2(S; M^3) \to \mathbb{R}$ which is defined in the following way: For $K > 0$ we know there exists a metric d^K which defines the weak topology on the ball of radius K. We define:

$$\tilde{d}^K(M_1, M_2) = \begin{cases} d^K(M_1, M_2), \text{ if } \|M_1\|_{L^2} < K \text{ and } \|M_2\|_{L^2} < K, \\ \qquad +\infty, \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The constant $K = K(R, \|B_w\|_{L^2}, \|V\|_{H^2})$ we choose in a way that the right hand side of (98) is bounded by e.g. $\frac{K}{2} - 1$, which can be accomplished due to Remark 3 and (99). By using Lemma 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 as well as the properties (97), (98), (107) we have that

$$\limsup_{\delta\to 0} \limsup_{h\to 0} g(\delta, h) = 0.$$

By the virtue of the diagonalization lemma of Attouch (see Lemma A.6) we obtain the existence of a sequence.
The case $\gamma = \infty$. We choose again functions $A^\delta \in C^2(S; \mathrm{so}(3))$ such that $\lim_{\delta\to 0} \|A^\delta - A\|_{H^1} = 0$ and functions $\zeta^\delta \in C^1(S; C^1(I \times \mathcal{Y}; \mathbb{R}^2))$, $\psi^\delta \in C^1(S; C^1(I \times \mathcal{Y}))$, $c^\delta \in C^1(S; C^1(I; \mathbb{R}^3))$ such that

$$\lim_{\delta\to 0} \left\|\mathcal{U}_\infty(\zeta^\delta, \psi^\delta, c^\delta) - \Pi_\infty\big(B_w - \tfrac{1}{2}A^2_{\text{tan}}, -b_V\big)\right\|_{L^2(S;\mathbb{M}^3)} = 0. \tag{111}$$

We now define

$$\begin{aligned}
&\bar{o}^\delta_\alpha = \zeta^\delta_\alpha, \;\; \text{for } \alpha = 1,2; \; \bar{o}^\delta_3 = \psi^\delta, \\
&\bar{p}^\delta_\alpha = t(A^\delta)^2\tau_i \cdot n + \int_{-1/2}^t c^\delta_\alpha, \; \text{for } \alpha = 1,2; \; \bar{p}^\delta_3 = \frac{t}{2}(A^\delta)^2 n \cdot n + \int_{-1/2}^t c^\delta_3
\end{aligned}$$

and repeat the same arguments as in the case $\gamma \in (0, \infty)$.

Construction for $\gamma = 0$ *and* $\lim_{h\to 0} \frac{\varepsilon(h)^2}{h} \in [0, \infty)$:

In this case the proof is similar as for the Step 1, but it is not allowable to take $\tilde{o}^\delta$ as above. Also one has to change the functions $w^{\delta,h}$. Let us again take $A^\delta \in C^2(S; \mathrm{so}(3))$ such that $\lim_{\delta\to 0} \|A^\delta - A\|_{H^1} = 0$ and $\zeta^\delta \in C^1(S; C^1(\mathcal{Y}; \mathbb{R}^2))$, $\varphi^\delta \in C^1(S; C^2(\mathcal{Y}))$, $g^\delta \in C^1(S; C^1(I \times \mathcal{Y}; \mathbb{R}^3))$ such that

$$\lim_{\delta\to 0} \left\|\mathcal{U}^0_0(\zeta^\delta, \varphi^\delta, g^\delta) - \Pi^0_0\big(B_w - \tfrac{1}{2}A^2_{\text{tan}}, -b_V\big)\right\|_{L^2(S;\mathbb{M}^3)} = 0, \tag{112}$$

in the case when $\lim_{h\to 0} \frac{\varepsilon(h)^2}{h} = 0$ i.e.

$$\lim_{\delta\to 0} \left\|\mathcal{U}^{1,\gamma_1}_0(\zeta^\delta, \varphi^\delta, g^\delta) - \Pi^{1,\gamma_1}_0\big(B_w - \tfrac{1}{2}A^2_{\text{tan}}, -b_V\big)\right\|_{L^2(S;\mathbb{M}^3)} = 0, \tag{113}$$

in the case when $\lim_{h\to 0} \frac{\varepsilon(h)^2}{h} = \frac{1}{\gamma_1} \in (0, \infty)$. We define

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{v}^{\delta,h} &= v^{\delta,h}, \\
\tilde{w}^{\delta,h} &= w^{\delta,h} + \tfrac{\varepsilon(h)^2}{h}\varphi^\delta(\hat{x}, \tfrac{r(\hat{x})}{\varepsilon(h)})n, \\
\bar{o}^\delta_\alpha &= \zeta^\delta_\alpha, \;\; \text{for } \alpha = 1,2; \; \tilde{o}^\delta_3 = 0, \\
\bar{p}^\delta_\alpha &= t(A^\delta)^2\tau_i \cdot n + \int_{-1/2}^t g^\delta_\alpha(\hat{x}, \tfrac{r(\hat{x})}{\varepsilon(h)}, s)\,\mathrm{d}s, \; \text{for } \alpha = 1,2; \\
\tilde{p}^\delta_3 &= \frac{t}{2}(A^\delta)^2 n \cdot n + \int_{-1/2}^t g^\delta_3(\hat{x}, \tfrac{r(\hat{x})}{\varepsilon(h)}, s)\,\mathrm{d}s,
\end{aligned}$$

where $v^{\delta,h}$ is defined in (89) and $w^{\delta,h}$ is defined by the property (88). Notice that $\tilde{w}^{\delta,h}$ satisfies the condition (87) with $M_1 \le C\|\hat{\nabla}^2_y \varphi^\delta\|$, for some constant $C > 0$, independent of δ. Also using the following identities

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla\tilde{w}^{\delta,h} &= \nabla w^{\delta,h} + \tfrac{\varepsilon(h)}{h}O(1), \\
\nabla\big((\nabla\tilde{w}^{\delta,h})^T n\big) &= \nabla\big((\nabla w^{\delta,h})^T n\big) + \tfrac{1}{h}\sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \partial_{y_i y_j}\varphi^\delta \tau^i \otimes \tau^j + \tfrac{\varepsilon(h)}{h}O(1), \\
q_{\tilde{w}^{\delta,h}} &= q_{w^{\delta,h}} + \tfrac{\varepsilon(h)^2}{h}\big(\varphi^\delta(\hat{x}, \tfrac{r(\hat{x})}{\varepsilon(h)})n\big)\Pi,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\limsup_{h\to 0} \|O(1)\|_{L^\infty} < \infty$ we can repeat the same argument as in the case $\gamma \in (0,\infty)$. Namely, notice that the right hand side of (98) can be bounded, by a bound independently of δ, due to Remark 3 and (113) and due to the fact that the appropriate p^δ still satisfies (105).

$\square$

Theorem 4.5. *Let W satisfy Assumption 2.3 and assume that $(u^h) \subset H^1(S^h;\mathbb{R}^3)$ satisfies*

$$\limsup_{h\to 0} \tfrac{1}{h^4} E^h(u^h) < \infty, \tag{114}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} E^h(u^h) &= \frac{1}{h}\int_{S^h} \bar{W}(x, \tfrac{r(\pi(x))}{\varepsilon(h)}, \nabla u^h)dx, \\ \bar{W}(x,y,\cdot) &= W(\hat{x} + thn(\hat{x}), y, \cdot),\ \forall(\hat{x},t) \in S\times I, \ \ \textit{for a.e } y \in Y. \end{aligned}$$

Define $\{\bar{y}^h\}_{h>0} \subset H^1(S^1;\mathbb{R}^3)$ by setting.

$$\bar{y}^h(\hat{x}+tn(\hat{x})) = u^h(\hat{x}+thn(\hat{x})) \quad \forall \hat{x}\in S\ \forall t \in I.$$

Then we have

- *(i) (compactness). There exists a subsequence, still denoted by $(\bar{y}^h)$ that satisfies the following property: There exist $\{Q^h\}_{h>0} \subset \mathrm{SO}(3)$, $\{c^h\}_{h>0} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ such that the sequences $y^h := (Q^h)^T\bar{y}^h - c^h$ and*

  $$V^h = \frac{1}{h}\int_I \big(\bar{y}^h(\hat{x}+tn(\hat{x})) - \hat{x}\big)dt$$

  satisfy

  - *(a) $y^h \to \pi$ strongly in $H^1(S^1;\mathbb{R}^3)$.*
  - *(b)*

    $$V^h \to V \textit{ strongly in } H^1(S;\mathbb{R}^3)$$

    Moreover, $V \in H^2(S;\mathbb{R}^3)$ is an infinitesimal bending of S.
  - *(c) $\frac{1}{h}q_{V^h} \rightharpoonup B_w$ weakly in $L^2(S;\mathbb{M}^2(T_{\hat{x}}S))$.*

- *(ii) (lower bound). For every $\{u^h\}_{h>0} \subset H^1(S^1;\mathbb{R}^3)$ that satisfies (114) and (a)-(c) from (i) the following is true:*

  - *(a) In the case when $\lim_{h\to 0}\frac{h}{\varepsilon(h)} = \gamma \in (0,\infty]$ we have that $\liminf_{h\to 0}\frac{1}{h^4}E^h(u^h) \geq I_\gamma(V,B_w)$,, where I_γ is defined in (84).*
  - *(b) In the case $\varepsilon \gg h \gg \varepsilon^2$ we have*

    $$\liminf_{h\to 0} \tfrac{1}{h^4}E^h(u^h) \geq I_0^0(V,B_w),$$

    where I_0^0 is defined in (85).
  - *(c) In the case when $h \sim \varepsilon^2$ and*

    $$\lim_{h\to 0} \tfrac{\varepsilon(h)^2}{h} = \tfrac{1}{\gamma_1} \in (0,\infty)$$

    we have that $\liminf_{h\to 0}\frac{1}{h^4}E^h(u^h) \geq I_0^{1,\gamma_1}(V,B_w)$, where I_0^{1,γ_1} is defined in (86).

- *(iii) (recovery sequence) For any infinitesimal bending $V \in H^2(S^1,\mathbb{R}^3)$ of S and any $B_w \in \mathcal{B}$ there exists $(u^h) \subset H^1(S^h;\mathbb{R}^3)$ such that (114) and (a)-(c) of (i) are satisfied with $Q^h = I$ and $c^h = 0$. Moreover, equalities hold in the appropriate cases (a)-(c) of (ii).*

5 Convex shell

In this chapter we shall identify the Γ-limit for convex shells in the remaining case, i.e. $h \ll \varepsilon^2$. We want to demonstrate the stronger influence of the geometry in this case. We work under the assumption that there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\Pi(\hat{x})\tau \cdot \tau \geq C\tau \cdot \tau, \forall \hat{x} \in S, \tau \in T_{\hat{x}}S. \tag{115}$$

Definition 5.1. For $\hat{x} \in S$ we define the following operator

$$\mathcal{U}_0^{2,c} : \dot{L}^2(\mathcal{Y}; \mathbb{M}^2_{\text{sym}}) \times L^2(I \times \mathcal{Y}; \mathbb{R}^3) \to L^2(I \times \mathcal{Y}; \mathbb{M}^3_{\text{sym}}),$$

$$\mathcal{U}_0^{2,c}(B_o, g) = \left\{ \sum_{i,j=1}^{3} M_{ij} \tau^i \otimes \tau^j \ : M = \begin{pmatrix} \begin{matrix} & B_o & \end{matrix} & \begin{matrix} g_1 \\ g_2 \end{matrix} \\ (g_1, \ g_2) & g_3 \end{pmatrix} \right\},$$

and function space of *relaxation fields*

$$L_0^{2,c}(I \times \mathcal{Y}; \mathbb{M}^3_{\text{sym}}) := \mathfrak{Im}\, \mathcal{U}_0^{2,c}. \tag{116}$$

Again as before it can be seen that $L_0^{2,c}(I \times \mathcal{Y}; \mathbb{M}^3_{\text{sym}})$ is a closed subspace of $L^2(I \times \mathcal{Y}; \mathbb{M}^3_{\text{sym}})$. We also define the functional $I_0^{2,c} : H^2(S; \mathbb{R}^3) \times L^2(S; \mathbb{M}^2(T_{\hat{x}}S)) \to \mathbb{R}$

$$I_0^{2,c}(V, B_w) = \int_S \mathcal{Q}_0^{2,c}\big(\hat{x}, B_w - \tfrac{1}{2}(A^2)_{\tan}, -b_V\big)\, \mathrm{d}\hat{x}, \tag{117}$$

with the quadratic form

$$\mathcal{Q}_0^{2,c}(\hat{x}, M^1_{\tan}, M^2_{\tan}) = \inf_{U \in L_0^{2,c}(I \times \mathcal{Y}; \mathbb{M}^3_{\text{sym}})} \iint_{I \times \mathcal{Y}} \mathcal{Q}\Big(\hat{x}, t, y, M^1_{\tan} + tM^2_{\tan} + U\Big)\, \mathrm{d}t\, \mathrm{d}y. \tag{118}$$

As before, it is easy to see that the definition is equivalent to the following one:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_0^{2,c}(\hat{x}, M^1_{\tan}, M^2_{\tan}) \quad &= \\ \inf_{\tilde{B}_o \in \dot{L}^2(\mathcal{Y}; \mathbb{M}^2_{\text{sym}})} \iint_{I \times \mathcal{Y}} &\mathcal{Q}_2\Big(\hat{x}, t, y, M^1_{\tan} + tM^2_{\tan} + \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} (\tilde{B}_o)_{ij} \tau_i \otimes \tau_j\big)\, \mathrm{d}t\, \mathrm{d}y. \end{aligned} \tag{119}$$

In the case when $\mathcal{Q}$ does not depend on t we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_0^{2,c}(\hat{x}, M^1_{\tan}, M^2_{\tan}) \quad &= \quad \inf_{\tilde{B}_o \in \dot{L}^2(\mathcal{Y}; \mathbb{M}^2_{\text{sym}})} \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \mathcal{Q}_2(\hat{x}, y, M^1_{\tan} + \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} (\tilde{B}_o)_{ij} \tau^i \otimes \tau^j)\, \mathrm{d}y \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{12} \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \mathcal{Q}_2(\hat{x}, y, M^2_{\tan})\, \mathrm{d}y. \end{aligned}$$

Under the assumption (115) it is well-known that $\mathcal{B} = L^2(S, \mathbb{M}^2_{\text{sym}}(TS))$, cf. e.g. [Cia00], [LMP10]. Thus if one wants to additionally to relax the functional $I_0^{2,c}$ with respect to B_w, one in this case obtains the functional $\tilde{I}_0^{2,c} : H^2(S; \mathbb{R}^3) \to \mathbb{R}$

$$\tilde{I}_0^{2,c}(V) = \frac{1}{12} \int_S \mathcal{Q}_2(\hat{x}, b_V)\, \mathrm{d}\hat{x}. \tag{120}$$

This functional is the same as in the ordinary von Kármán model. For the form $\mathcal{Q}_0^{2,c}$ one can make assertions analogous to Lemma 4.1 with the appropriate operator $\Pi_0^{2,c}$ and Lemma 4.2. We introduce the space

$$\begin{aligned} FL(S; \dot{C}^\infty(\mathcal{Y})) = \Big\{ (x, y) \mapsto \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^2,\ |k| \leq n,\ k \neq 0} & c^k(x) e^{2\pi i k \cdot y} : \\ & n \in \mathbf{N} \text{ and } c^k \in C_0^1(S; \mathbb{C}) \text{ with } \overline{c}^k = c^{-k} \Big\}. \end{aligned}$$

By Fourier transform it can be easily seen that $FL(S; C^\infty(\mathcal{Y}))$ is dense in $L^2(S; \dot{H}^m(\mathcal{Y}))$, for any $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$. The following lemma resembles Lemma 3.3 in [Sch07]:

Lemma 5.2. *Assume (115) and let* $B_o \in L^2(S; L^2(\mathcal{Y}; \mathbb{M}^2_{\rm sym}(TS)))$*. Then there exist unique* $w \in L^2(S; \dot{H}^1(\mathcal{Y}; \mathbb{R}^2))$ *and* $\varphi \in L^2(S; \dot{L}^2(Y))$ *such that*

$$\big(\operatorname{sym} \nabla_y w\big)_{ij} + \varphi \Pi_{ij} = (B_o)_{ij}, \text{ for every } i, j = 1, 2. \tag{121}$$

Moreover, if $(B_o)_{ij} \in FL(S; \dot{C}^\infty(\mathcal{Y}))$ *for every* $i, j = 1, 2$ *then* $w_i \in FL(S; \dot{H}^1(\mathcal{Y}))$*, for* $i = 1, 2$ *and* $\varphi \in FL(S; \dot{H}^1(\mathcal{Y}))$

Proof. One possible proof is to apply the operator $\operatorname{curl}_y \operatorname{curl}_y$ to both sides of (121), which leads to the PDE

$$\operatorname{cof} \Pi : \nabla_y^2 \varphi = \operatorname{curl}_y \operatorname{curl}_y B,$$

which by virtue of (115) is an elliptic PDE with constant coefficients (for each x). We prefer to give a direct proof.
There exist b_{ij}^k such that for all $i, j = 1, 2$:

$$(B_o(\hat{x}, y))_{ij} = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^2} b_{ij}^k(\hat{x}) e^{2\pi i k \cdot y}, \text{ where } \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \|b_{ij}^k\|_{L^2} < \infty, \overline{b}_{ij}^k = b_{ij}^{-k}.$$

We assume that for $i = 1, 2$:

$$w_j = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^2} c_j^k(\hat{x}) e^{2\pi i k \cdot y}, \ \overline{c}_j^k = c_j^{-k}, \ c_j^0 = 0$$

and

$$\varphi = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^2} d^k(\hat{x}) e^{2\pi i k \cdot y}, \ \overline{d}^k = d^{-k}, \ d^0 = 0.$$

The equation (121) is equivalent to the following problem for every $(k_1, k_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ find complex coefficients c_j^k, b_{ij}^k, d^k such that

$$\begin{aligned} k_1 c_1^k + d^k \Pi_{11} &= b_{11}^k \\ \frac{1}{2}(k_2 c_1^k + k_1 c_2^k) + d^k \Pi_{12} &= b_{12}^k \\ k_2 c_2^k + d^k \Pi_{22} &= b_{22}^k. \end{aligned}$$

By (2) and (115) it is easy to see that there exists $C > 0$ such that the discriminant is bounded from below by $C(k_1^2 + k_2^2)$. Using this it follows that there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$|d^k(\hat{x})|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^2 |k|^2 |c_i^k(\hat{x})|^2 \leq C(\sum_{i,j=1}^2 |b_{ij}^k(\hat{x})|^2), \forall \hat{x} \in S.$$

Now all claims follow easily. ☐

Theorem 5.3. *Assume (115) and that* $h \ll \varepsilon^2$ *and that* W *satisfies Assumption 2.3. Let* $(u^h) \subset H^1(S^h; \mathbb{R}^3)$ *satisfy*

$$\limsup_{h \to 0} \tfrac{1}{h^4} E^h(u^h) < \infty, \tag{122}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} E^h(u^h) &= \frac{1}{h} \int_{S^h} \bar{W}(x, \tfrac{r(\pi(x))}{\varepsilon(h)}, \nabla u^h) dx, \\ \bar{W}(x, y, \cdot) &= W(\hat{x} + thn(\hat{x}), y, \cdot), \ \forall (\hat{x}, t) \in S \times I, \ \text{for a.e } y \in Y. \end{aligned}$$

Define $(\bar{y}^h) \subset H^1(S^1; \mathbb{R}^3)$ *by*

$$\bar{y}^h(\hat{x} + tn(\hat{x})) = u^h(\hat{x} + thn(\hat{x})) \quad \forall \hat{x} \in S, \ t \in I.$$

Then we have

(i) (compactness). For every subsequence of $(\bar{y}^h)$ *there exists a further subsequence, still denoted by* $(\bar{y}^h)$ *that satisfies the following property: There exist* $\{Q^h\}_{h>0} \subset \mathrm{SO}(3)$, $\{c^h\}_{h>0} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ *such that the sequences* $y^h := (Q^h)^T \bar{y}^h - c^h$ *and* $V^h := \frac{1}{h}\int_I \big(\bar{y}^h(\hat{x} + tn(\hat{x})) - \hat{x}\big)dt$ *satisfy*

   (a) $y^h \to \pi$ *strongly in* $H^1(S^1;\mathbb{R}^3)$.

   (b) $V^h \to V$ *strongly in* $H^1(S;\mathbb{R}^3)$. *Moreover,* $V \in H^2(S;\mathbb{R}^3)$ *is an infinitesimal bending of* S.

   (c) $\frac{1}{h} q_{V^h} \rightharpoonup: B_w$ *weakly in* $L^2(S;\mathbb{M}^2(TS))$.

(ii) (lower bound). For every $\{u^h\}_{h>0} \subset H^1(S^1;\mathbb{R}^3)$ *that satisfies (122) and (a)-(c) from (i), we have*

$$\liminf_{h\to 0} \tfrac{1}{h^4} E^h(u^h) \geq I_0^{2,c}(V, B_w),$$

where $I_0^{2,c}$ *is defined in (117).*

(iii) (recovery sequence) For an arbitrary infintesimal bending $V \in H^2(S^1,\mathbb{R}^3)$ *and* $B_w \in \mathcal{B}$ *there exists* $\{u^h\}_{h>0} \subset H^1(S^h;\mathbb{R}^3)$ *such that (122) and (a)-(c) of (i) are satisfied with* $Q^h = I$ *and* $c^h = 0$. *Moreover, equality holds in (ii).*

Proof. We will only give the sketch of the proof since it is analogous to the previous cases. Since V is an infinitesimal bending, we have

$$\partial_\tau V(\hat{x}) = A(\hat{x})\tau, \text{ for all } \tau \in T_{\hat{x}}S \text{ for some } A \in H^1(S;\mathrm{so}(3)), \tag{123}$$

Let us assume as in Proposition 3.6 that

$$\nabla^2(V_s^h \cdot n) \xrightharpoonup{2,\gamma} \nabla^2(An) + \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} (\partial^2_{y_i y_j}\varphi)\tau^i \otimes \tau^j,$$

for some $\varphi \in L^2(S;\dot{H}^2(\mathcal{Y}))$. Using (iii) of Proposition 3.2 as well as Lemma 5.2 we conclude that $\varphi = 0$. Thus from Proposition 3.6 we conclude that for E^h defined in (38) we have $E^h \xrightharpoonup{2,\gamma} E(x,y)$ where

$$E \quad = \quad B - \tfrac{1}{2}(A^2)_{\mathrm{tan}} - tb_V + U, \tag{124}$$

for some $U \in L^2(S; L_0(I \times \mathcal{Y}; \mathbb{M}^3_{\mathrm{sym}}))$. The lower bound easily follows from Lemma 3.8 and the definition of the functional $I_0^{2,c}$.

To prove the upper bound we follow the proof of Proposition 4.4, the case $\gamma = 0$. Namely, let us again take $A^\delta \in C^2(S;\mathrm{so}(3))$ such that $\lim_{\delta\to 0}\|A^\delta - A\|_{H^1} = 0$ and B_o^δ such that for every $i,j = 1,2$, $(B_o^\delta)_{ij} \in FL(S;\dot{C}^\infty(\mathcal{Y}))$, $g^\delta \in C^1(S;C^1(I\times\mathcal{Y};\mathbb{R}^3))$ and

$$\lim_{\delta\to 0}\left\|\mathcal{U}_0^{2,c}(B_o^\delta, g^\delta) - \Pi_0^{2,c}\big(B_w - \tfrac{1}{2}A^2_{\mathrm{tan}}, -b_V\big)\right\|_{L^2(S;\mathbb{M}^3)} = 0. \tag{125}$$

We define

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tilde{v}^{\delta,h} = v^{\delta,h},\\
&\tilde{w}^{\delta,h} = w^{\delta,h} + \varphi^\delta(\hat{x}, \tfrac{r(\hat{x})}{\varepsilon(h)})n + \varepsilon(h)\big(z_1^\delta(\hat{x}, \tfrac{r(\hat{x})}{\varepsilon(h)})\tau^1 + z_2^\delta(\hat{x}, \tfrac{r(\hat{x})}{\varepsilon(h)})\tau^2\big),\\
&\bar{o}_\alpha^\delta = \zeta_\alpha^\delta, \ \text{ for } \alpha = 1,2; \ \bar{o}_3^\delta = 0,\\
&\bar{p}_\alpha^\delta = t(A^\delta)^2\tau_i \cdot n + \int_{-1/2}^{t} g_\alpha^\delta, \text{ for } \alpha = 1,2; \ \bar{p}_3^\delta = \frac{t}{2}(A^\delta)^2 n\cdot n + \int_{-1/2}^{t} g_3^\delta,
\end{aligned}$$

where $v^{\delta,h}$ is defined in (89) and $w^{\delta,h}$ is defined by the property (88). By Lemma 5.2 there exist $z^\delta \in (FL(S;\dot{C}^\infty(\mathcal{Y})))^2$ and $\varphi^\delta \in FL(S;\dot{C}^\infty(\mathcal{Y})$ solving the system

$$\big(\mathrm{sym}\,\nabla_y z^\delta\big)_{ij} + \varphi^\delta \Pi_{ij} = (B_o^\delta)_{ij}, \text{ for every } i,j = 1,2. \tag{126}$$

Notice that, similarly as before:

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla \tilde{w}^{\delta,h} &= \nabla w^{\delta,h} + \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon(h)} O(1), \\
\nabla\big((\nabla \tilde{w}^{\delta,h})^T n\big) &= \nabla\big((\nabla w^{\delta,h})^T n\big) + \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon(h)^2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \partial_{y_i y_j} \varphi^\delta \tau^i \otimes \tau^j + \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon(h)} O(1), \\
q_{\tilde{w}^{\delta,h}} &= q_{w^{\delta,h}} + B_o^\delta + \varepsilon(h) O(1),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\limsup_{h\to 0} \|O(1)\|_{L^\infty} < \infty$. Now we continue as in the proof of Proposition 4.4, after concluding that $\tilde{w}^{\delta,h}$ satisfies the condition (87). Boundedness of the right hand side of (98) follows easily from the coercivity of the functional $\mathcal{U}_0^{2,c}$. $\square$

A Auxiliary results

In the sequel we consider $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ a Lipschitz domain and $\tau_i = \mathbf{e}_i$, for $i = 1, 2, 3$, where $\mathbf{e}_i$ are standard coordinate vectors. The claims can be trivially extended to $\mathbb{R}^n$. For the proofs see e.g. [All92]. For the last claim see [Vel][Lemma 3].

Lemma A.1. *(i) Any sequence that is bounded in $L^2(\Omega)$ admits a two-scale convergence subsequence.*

(ii) Let $f \in L^2(\Omega \times \mathcal{Y})$ and $\{f^h\}_{h>0} \subset L^2(\Omega)$ be such that $f^h \overset{2,\gamma}{\rightharpoonup} f(x,y)$ weakly. Then $f^h \rightharpoonup \int_Y f(\cdot, y)\, dy$ weakly in $L^2(\Omega)$.

(iii) Let $f^0 \in L^2(\Omega)$ and $\{f^h\}_{h>0} \subset L^2(\Omega)$ be such that $f^h \rightharpoonup f^0$ weakly in L^2. Then (after passing to subsequences) we have $f^h \overset{2,\gamma}{\rightharpoonup} f^0(x) + \bar{f}(x,y)$ for some $\bar{f} \in L^2(\Omega \times Y)$ with $\int_Y \bar{f}(\cdot, y)\, dy = 0$ almost everywhere in Ω.

(iv) Let $f^0 \in L^2(\Omega)$ and $\{f^h\}_{h>0} \subset L^2(\Omega)$ be such that $f^h \to f^0$ strongly in L^2. Then $f^h \xrightarrow{2,\gamma} f^0(x)$.

(v) Let $f^0 \in H^1(\Omega)$ and $\{f^h\}_{h>0} \subset H^1(\Omega)$ be such that $f^h \rightharpoonup f^0$ weakly in H^1. Then (after passing to subsequences)

$$\nabla f^h \overset{2,\gamma}{\rightharpoonup} \nabla f^0 + \nabla_y \phi(x,y)$$

for some $\phi \in L^2(\Omega, \dot{H}^1(\mathcal{Y}))$.

(vi) Let $f^0 \in H^2(\Omega)$ and $\{f^h\}_{h>0} \subset H^2(\Omega)$ be such that $f^h \rightharpoonup f^0$ weakly in H^2. Then (after passing to subsequences)

$$\nabla^2 f^h \overset{2,\gamma}{\rightharpoonup} \nabla^2 f^0 + \nabla_y^2 \phi(x,y)$$

for some $\phi \in L^2(\Omega, \dot{H}^2(\mathcal{Y}))$.

At several places in our argument we are only interested in the oscillatory part of the two-scale limit. In the following, we introduce as in [HNV] the special notation $\overset{osc,\gamma}{\rightharpoonup}$ for that purpose. As a motivation consider a sequence $\{f^h\}_{h>0} \subset L^2(\Omega)$ with weak two-scale limit $f \in L^2(\Omega \times Y)$. Consider

$$f^0(x) := \int_Y f(x,y)\, dy \qquad \text{and} \qquad \bar{f}(x,y) = f(x,y) - f^0(x).$$

According to Lemma A.1 the function f^0 is the weak limit of f^h. We call $\bar{f}(x,y)$ the oscillatory part of f. Evidently we have

$$\lim_{h\to 0} \int_\Omega f^h(x) \varphi(x) g(\tfrac{x'}{\varepsilon(h)})\, dx = \iint_{\Omega\times Y} \bar{f}(x,y) \varphi(x) g(y)\, dy\, dx$$
$$\text{for all } \varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega) \text{ and } g \in C^\infty(\mathcal{Y}) \text{ with } \int_Y g\, dy = 0. \qquad (127)$$

Motivated by that we introduce the following vocabulary:

Definition A.2. For a sequence $\{f^h\}_{h>0} \subset L^2(\Omega)$ and $\bar{f} \in L^2(\Omega \times Y)$ with $\int_Y \bar{f}(\cdot, y)\, dy = 0$ almost everywhere in Ω we write

$$f^h \overset{osc,\gamma}{\rightharpoonup} \bar{f}(x,y),$$

if (127) holds for all $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ and $g \in C^\infty(\mathcal{Y})$.

Lemma A.3. *Let f^0 and $f^h \in L^2(\Omega)$ be such that $f^h \rightharpoonup f^0$ weakly in $L^2(\Omega)$ and $f^h \overset{osc,\gamma}{\rightharpoonup} \bar{f}(x,y)$. Then $f^h \overset{2,\gamma}{\rightharpoonup} f^0(x) + \bar{f}(x,y)$ weakly two-scale.*

Proof. Straightforward. ☐

The following Lemma was needed in the proof of Proposition 3.2.

Lemma A.4. *(i) Let f^0 and $f^h \in H^1(\Omega)$ be such that $f^h \rightharpoonup f^0$ weakly in $H^1(\Omega)$ and assume that*

$$\nabla f^h \overset{2,\gamma}{\rightharpoonup} \nabla f^0 + \nabla_y \phi(x,y)$$

for some $\phi \in L^2(\Omega; \dot{H}^1(\mathcal{Y}))$. Then

$$\frac{f^h}{\varepsilon(h)} \overset{osc,\gamma}{\rightharpoonup} \phi.$$

(ii) Let f^0 and $f^h \in H^1(\Omega)$ be such that $f^h \rightharpoonup f^0$ weakly in $H^2(\Omega)$ and assume that

$$\nabla^2 f^h \overset{2,\gamma}{\rightharpoonup} \nabla^2 f^0 + \nabla_y^2 \phi(x,y)$$

for some $\phi \in L^2(\Omega; \dot{H}^2(\mathcal{Y}))$. Then

$$\frac{f^h}{\varepsilon(h)^2} \overset{osc,\gamma}{\rightharpoonup} \phi.$$

Proof. The proof of (i)

We have to show that

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon(h)} \int_\Omega f^h(x) g(\frac{x}{\varepsilon(h)}) \psi(x)\, dx \to \iint_{\Omega \times Y} \phi(x,y) g(y) \psi(x)\, dx \tag{128}$$

for all $g \in C^\infty(\mathcal{Y})$ with $\int_Y g\, dy = 0$ and $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$. For simplicity we write ε instead of $\varepsilon(h)$. Let G denote the unique solution in $C^\infty(\mathcal{Y})$ to

$$-\Delta_y G = g, \qquad \int_Y G\, dy = 0.$$

Set $G^h(x) := \varepsilon G(\frac{x'}{\varepsilon})$ so that

$$\Delta G^h(x) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} g(\frac{x'}{\varepsilon}).$$

Also notice that $\partial_{x_3} G^h = 0$. Hence, the l. h. s. of (128) turns into

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_S f^h \Delta G^h \psi\, dx \\
&= \int_\Omega f^h \Big(\Delta(G^h \psi) - 2\nabla G^h \cdot \nabla \psi - G^h \Delta \psi \Big)\, dx \\
&= -\int_\Omega \nabla f^h \cdot \nabla(G^h \psi)\, dx - 2 \int_\Omega f^h (\nabla G^h \cdot \nabla \psi)\, dx - \int_\Omega f^h\, G^h \Delta \psi\, dx.
\end{aligned} \tag{129}$$

By the chain rule and the definition of G^h we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla(G^h \psi)(x) &= \nabla G^h(x) \psi(x) + G^h(x) \nabla \psi(x) \\
&= \nabla_y G(\tfrac{x'}{\varepsilon}) \psi(x) + \varepsilon G(\tfrac{x}{\varepsilon}) \nabla \psi(x),
\end{aligned}$$

where we write for the convenience $\nabla_y G = (\nabla_y G \mid 0)$, whenever it is necessary. Since the right-hand side strongly two-scale converges to $\nabla_y G(y)\psi(x)$, and because $\nabla f^h \overset{2,\gamma}{\rightharpoonup} \nabla f^0 + \nabla_y \phi(x,y)$ by assumption, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & -\int_\Omega \nabla f^h \cdot \nabla(G^h \psi)\, dx \\ \to & \quad -\iint_{\Omega\times Y} \Big(\nabla f^0(x) + \nabla_y \phi(x,y)\Big) \cdot \Big(\nabla_y G(y)\psi(x)\Big)\, dy\, dx \\ & \quad = \iint_{\Omega\times Y} \phi(x,y)\Delta_y G(y)\psi(x)\, dy\, dx \\ & \quad = \iint_{\Omega\times Y} \phi(x,y) g(y)\psi(x)\, dy\, dx. \end{aligned}$$

Hence it suffices to show that the second and third integral on the right-hand side of (129) vanish for $h \to 0$. We treat the second integral. Since $\nabla G^h(x') = \nabla_y G(\frac{x'}{\varepsilon})$ strongly two-scale converges to $\nabla_y G(y)$, and because $f^h \nabla\psi \to f^0 \nabla\psi$ strongly in $L^2(\Omega)$, we deduce that

$$\int_\Omega f^h(\nabla G^h \cdot \nabla\psi)\, dx \to \iint_{\Omega\times Y} f^0(x)\nabla\psi(x) \cdot \nabla_y G(y)\, dy\, dx = 0.$$

The third integral on the right-hand side of (129) vanishes simply because $f^h \Delta\psi$ is bounded in $L^2(\Omega)$ and $G^h \to 0$ in $L^2(\Omega)$. The last claim is obvious from the proof.

Proof of (ii). We define G in the same way as in (i) and we put $G^h(x) = g(\frac{x'}{\varepsilon})$. Then $\Delta_y G^h(x) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} g(\frac{x'}{\varepsilon})$ and $\nabla G^h(x) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\nabla_y G(\frac{x'}{\varepsilon})$.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\int_\Omega f^h(x) g(\frac{x'}{\varepsilon^2})\psi(x)\, dx &= \int_S f^h \Delta G^h \psi\, dx \qquad (130) \\ &= -\int_\Omega \nabla f^h \cdot \nabla(G^h\psi)\, dx - 2\int_\Omega f^h(\nabla G^h \cdot \nabla\psi)\, dx \\ &\quad -\int_\Omega f^h\, G^h \Delta\psi\, dx \\ &= \int_\Omega \Delta f^h (G^h\psi)\, dx - 2\int_\Omega f^h(\nabla G^h \cdot \nabla\psi)\, dx \\ &\quad -\int_\Omega f^h\, G^h \Delta\psi\, dx \\ &\to \iint_{\Omega\times Y} \Delta_y \phi(x,y) G(y)\psi\, dx\, dy \\ &= \iint_{\Omega\times Y} \phi(x,y) g(y)\psi\, dx\, dy, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (i).

□

The following proposition can be found in [FJM06, Proposition 2]

Proposition A.5. *Let Ω be a bounded Lipschitz domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and let $1 < p < \infty$, $k \in \mathbf{N}$ and $\lambda > 0$. Suppose that $u \in W^{k,p}(\Omega)$ and let*

$$|u|_k(x) := \sum_{|\alpha| \le k} |\nabla^\alpha u(x)|.$$

Then there exists $u^\lambda \in W^{k,\infty}$ *such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \|u^\lambda\|_{W^{k,\infty}} &\leq C(p,k,s)\lambda, \\ \big|\{x \in \Omega :\ u^\lambda(x) \neq u(x)\}\big| &\leq \frac{C(p,k)}{\lambda^p} \int_{|u|_k \geq \lambda/2} |u|_k^p \,\mathrm{d}x, \end{aligned}$$

$$\|u^\lambda\|_{W^{k,p}} \leq C(p,k,\Omega)\|u\|_{W^{k,p}}.$$

In particular

$$\lim_{\lambda\to\infty} \lambda^p \big|\{x \in \Omega :\ u^\lambda(x) \neq u(x)\}\big| = 0,$$

and

$$\lim_{\lambda\to\infty} \|u^\lambda - u\|_{W^{k,p}} = 0.$$

The following diagonalization lemma is due to [Att84, Corollary 1.16]:

Lemma A.6. *Let* $g : [0,\infty) \times [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ *and suppose that*

$$\limsup_{\delta\to 0} \limsup_{h\to 0} g(\delta,h) = 0.$$

Then there is a monotone function $(0,\infty) \ni h \mapsto \delta(h) \in (0,\infty)$ *with* $\lim_{h\to 0}\delta(h) = 0$ *and* $\limsup_{h\to 0} g(\delta(h),h) = 0$.

Acknowledgement. Both authors were supported by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft grant no. HO-4697/1-1. Part of this work was completed while the second author was affiliated with BCAM.

Peter Hornung

MAX-PLANCK-INSITUT FÜR MATHEMATIK IN DEN NATURWISSENSCHAFTEN
INSELSTR. 22
04103 LEIPZIG
GERMANY

Igor Velčić

MAX-PLANCK-INSITUT FÜR MATHEMATIK IN DEN NATURWISSENSCHAFTEN
INSELSTR. 22
04103 LEIPZIG
GERMANY

and

BASQUE CENTER OF APPLIED MATHEMATICS
ALAMEDA DE MAZARREDO 14
48009 BILBAO
SPAIN

References

[ABP91] Emilio Acerbi, Giuseppe Buttazzo, and Danilo Percivale. A variational definition of the strain energy for an elastic string. *J. Elasticity*, 25(2):137–148, 1991.

[All92] Grégoire Allaire. Homogenization and two-scale convergence. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 23(6):1482–1518, 1992.

[Att84] Hedy Attouch. *Variational convergence for functions and operators*. Applicable Mathematics Series. Pitman (Advanced Publishing Program), Boston, MA, 1984.

[BB06] Jean-François Babadjian and Margarida Baía. 3D–2D analysis of a thin film with periodic microstructure. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A*, 136(2):223–243, 2006.

[BFF00] Andrea Braides, Irene Fonseca, and Gilles Francfort. 3D-2D asymptotic analysis for inhomogeneous thin films. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 49(4):1367–1404, 2000.

[Bra85] Andrea Braides. Homogenization of some almost periodic coercive functional. *Rend. Accad. Naz. Sci. XL Mem. Mat. (5)*, 9(1):313–321, 1985.

[Cho97] Daniel Choi. On geometrical rigidity of surfaces. Application to the theory of thin linear elastic shells. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 7(4):507–555, 1997.

[Cia00] Philippe G. Ciarlet. *Mathematical elasticity. Vol. III*, volume 29 of *Studies in Mathematics and its Applications*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 2000. Theory of shells.

[CL96] Philippe G. Ciarlet and Véronique Lods. Asymptotic analysis of linearly elastic shells. I. Justification of membrane shell equations. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 136(2):119–161, 1996.

[CLM96] Philippe G. Ciarlet, Véronique Lods, and Bernadette Miara. Asymptotic analysis of linearly elastic shells. II. Justification of flexural shell equations. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 136(2):163–190, 1996.

[FJM02] Gero Friesecke, Richard D. James, and Stefan Müller. A theorem on geometric rigidity and the derivation of nonlinear plate theory from three-dimensional elasticity. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 55(11):1461–1506, 2002.

[FJM06] Gero Friesecke, Richard D. James, and Stefan Müller. A hierarchy of plate models derived from nonlinear elasticity by gamma-convergence. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 180(2):183–236, 2006.

[FJMM03] Gero Friesecke, Richard D. James, Maria Giovanna Mora, and Stefan Müller. Derivation of nonlinear bending theory for shells from three-dimensional nonlinear elasticity by Gamma-convergence. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 336(8):697–702, 2003.

[GSP95] Giuseppe Geymonat and Enrique Sánchez-Palencia. On the rigidity of certain surfaces with folds and applications to shell theory. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 129(1):11–45, 1995.

[HNV] Peter Hornung, Stefan Neukamm, and Igor Velčić. Derivation of the homogenized bending plate model from 3D nonlinear elasticity. *Preprint: http://arxiv.org/abs/1210.5461*.

[Hor12] Peter Hornung. The Willmore functional on isometric immersions. *MIS MPG Preprint*, 2012.

[LDR95] Hervé Le Dret and Annie Raoult. The nonlinear membrane model as variational limit of nonlinear three-dimensional elasticity. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 74(6):549–578, 1995.

[LDR96] H. Le Dret and A. Raoult. The membrane shell model in nonlinear elasticity: a variational asymptotic derivation. *J. Nonlinear Sci.*, 6(1):59–84, 1996.

[LMP10] Marta Lewicka, Maria Giovanna Mora, and Mohammad Reza Pakzad. Shell theories arising as low energy Γ-limit of 3d nonlinear elasticity. *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5)*, 9(2):253–295, 2010.

[Lut85] Adam Lutoborski. Homogenization of thin elastic shell. *Journal of Elasticity*, 15(1):69–87, 1985.

[MM03] Maria Giovanna Mora and Stefan Müller. Derivation of the nonlinear bending-torsion theory for inextensible rods by Γ-convergence. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 18(3):287–305, 2003.

[MM04] Maria Giovanna Mora and Stefan Müller. A nonlinear model for inextensible rods as a low energy Γ-limit of three-dimensional nonlinear elasticity. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 21(3):271–293, 2004.

[Mül87] Stefan Müller. Homogenization of nonconvex integral functionals and cellular elastic materials. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 99(3):189–212, 1987.

[Neu10] Stefan Neukamm. *Homogenization, linearization and dimension reduction in elasticity with variational methods*. Phd thesis, Tecnische Universität München, 2010.

[Neu12] Stefan Neukamm. Rigorous derivation of a homogenized bending-torsion theory for inextensible rods from three-dimensional elasticity. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 206(2):645–706, 2012.

[Ngu89] Gabriel Nguetseng. A general convergence result for a functional related to the theory of homogenization. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 20(3):608–623, 1989.

[NV] Stefan Neukamm and Igor Velčić. Derivation of a homogenized von Kármán plate theory from 3D elasticity. *Preprint: http://www.mis.mpg.de/preprints/2012/preprint2012_61.pdf*.

[Pan01] Olivier Pantz. Une justification partielle du modèle de plaque en flexion par Γ-convergence. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 332(6):587–592, 2001.

[Sch07] Bernd Schmidt. Plate theory for stressed heterogeneous multilayers of finite bending energy. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 88(1):107–122, 2007.

[SP89a] Évariste Sanchez-Palencia. Statique et dynamique des coques minces. I. Cas de flexion pure non inhibée. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 309(6):411–417, 1989.

[SP89b] Évariste Sanchez-Palencia. Statique et dynamique des coques minces. II. Cas de flexion pure inhibée. Approximation membranaire. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 309(7):531–537, 1989.

[Vel] Igor Velčić. Periodically wrinkled plate of Föppl von Kármán type. *to appear in Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci., preprint: http://arxiv.org/abs/1104.0661*.

[Vis06] Augusto Visintin. Towards a two-scale calculus. *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, 12(3):371–397 (electronic), 2006.

[Vis07] Augusto Visintin. Two-scale convergence of some integral functionals. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 29(2):239–265, 2007.